arXiv:1210.1992v1 [math.DS] 6 Oct 2012

ENTROPY THEORY FOR SOFIC GROUPOIDS I: THE FOUNDATIONS

LEWIS BOWEN

Abstract. This is the first part in a series in which sofic entropy theory is generalized to class-bijective extensions of sofic groupoids. Here we define topological and measure entropy and prove invariance. We also establish the variational principle, compute the entropy of Bernoulli shift actions and answer a question of Benjy Weiss pertaining to the isomorphism problem for non-free Bernoulli shifts. The proofs are independent of previous literature.

Keywords: groupoids, entropy, measured equivalence relations, sofic groups
MSC:37A35, 37A20, 20Lxx

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Organization 6
2. Discrete groupoids 6
3. Sofic approximations 9
4. Actions, extensions and factors 11
5. Spanning and separating sets 12
6. Topological entropy 13
7. Measure entropy via partitions 22
8. Replacing $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ with $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ 30
9. Measure entropy via pseudo-metrics 37
10. The variational principle 44
11. Bernoulli shifts 52
12. Non-free Bernoulli shifts 61
References 72

---

† Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0968762 and NSF CAREER Award DMS-0954606.

1. Introduction

A major motivation for this work comes from Rudolph-Weiss' discovery [RW00] that, while entropy is not an orbit-equivalence invariant, relative entropy with respect to the orbit-change sigma-algebra is invariant. From this fact it is possible to generalize classical entropy theory to extensions of measured equivalence relations [Da01, DP02]. These new ideas have led to the solution of a number of open problems [RW00, Da01, DP02, DG02, Av05, Av10, Bo12] as well as providing shorter proofs to known results. Recently, classical entropy theory has been extended to actions of sofic groups [Bo10b, KL11]. It is therefore natural to extend sofic entropy theory to equivalence relations and more generally, groupoids, which is the goal of the present paper. We begin with a short introduction to sofic groups, entropy theory (classical and sofic) and the Rudolph-Weiss result.

A countable discrete group G is *sofic* if there exists a sequence $\Sigma = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of set maps $\sigma_i : G \to \mathrm{Sym}(d_i)$ (the symmetric group on $\{1,\dots,d_i\}$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{i\to\infty} d_i^{-1}|\{1 \le p \le d_i :\ \sigma_i(g)p = p\}| \quad \forall g \in G \setminus \{e\} \\ 1 &= \lim_{i\to\infty} d_i^{-1}|\{1 \le p \le d_i :\ \sigma_i(g)\sigma_i(h)p = \sigma_i(gh)p\}| \quad \forall g,h \in G \\ +\infty &= \lim_{i\to\infty} d_i. \end{aligned}$$

Such a sequence is called a *sofic approximation* to G. This class of groups was defined implicitly by M. Gromov [Gr99], explicitly by B. Weiss [We00] and proven to satisfy a number of important conjectures such as Gottshalk's surjunctivity conjecture [Gr99, We00], Connes' embedding conjecture [ES05], the determinant conjecture [ES05] and Kaplansky's direct finiteness conjecture [ES04]. All amenable groups and residually finite groups are sofic. By Mal'cev's Theorem [Ma40], all finitely generated linear groups are residually finite. Since a group is sofic if and only if all of its finitely generated subgroups are sofic, this implies all countable linear groups are sofic. It is unknown whether all countable groups are sofic. The concept of soficity was generalized from groups to unimodular random rooted networks and measured equivalence relations in [AL07] (see also [EL10]) and to groupoids in [DKP11]. V. Pestov has written an illuminating survey article [Pe08].

Entropy is an important invariant for classifying dynamical systems. To explain, let G be a countable group, (X,μ) a standard Borel probability space and $T : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(X,\mu)$ a homomorphism into the group of pmp (probability-measure-preserving) transformations of (X,μ). Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a finite Borel partition of X. Define

$$\begin{aligned} H_\mu(\mathcal{P}) &:= -\sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \mu(P)\log\mu(P) \\ h_\mu(T,\mathcal{P}) &:= \inf_{F\subset G} |F|^{-1} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{f\in F} f\mathcal{P}\right) \\ h_\mu(T) &:= \sup_{\mathcal{P}} h_\mu(T,\mathcal{P}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bigvee_{f\in F} f\mathcal{P}$ denotes the common refinement of the partitions $f\mathcal{P}$ (for $f\in F$), the infimum in the second line is over all finite subsets of G and the supremum in the last line is over all finite Borel partitions $\mathcal{P}$ of X.

The quantity $h_\mu(T)$ is the *entropy rate* of T and is clearly an invariant of the action. While this definition makes sense for actions of any group G, it has only proven useful for actions of amenable groups. Recall that G is *amenable* if there exists a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of finite subsets $F_i\subset G$ such that for any finite $K\subset G$,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{|F_i\cap F_iK|}{|F_i|}=1.$$

Such a sequence is called a Følner sequence.

A partition $\mathcal{P}$ is *generating* for T if the smallest $T(G)$-invariant sigma-algebra containing $\mathcal{P}$ is the sigma-algebra of all measurable sets (up to measure zero). The Kolmogorov-Sinai Theorem (initially proven for $G=\mathbb{Z}$ and extended to amenable groups by other authors) states that if $\mathcal{P}$ is a finite generating partition for T then

$$h_\mu(T,\mathcal{P}) = h_\mu(T) = \lim_{i\to\infty}|F_i|^{-1}H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{f\in F_i} f\mathcal{P}\right)$$

where $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is any Følner sequence (for example, see [Ol85]). This result is of fundamental importance because it makes the computation of entropy possible.

The Kolmogorov-Sinai Theorem does not hold for non-amenable groups, but in this case $h_\mu(T)$ as defined above is really not the appropriate definition. For example, let G be a countable group, K be a finite set and κ be a probability measure on K. Let G act on the product space $(K,\kappa)^G$ by $(g\cdot x)(f)=x(g^{-1}f)$ for $x\in K^G, g,f\in G$ (where we interpret an element of $x\in K^G$ to be a function $x:G\to K$). This is called the *Bernoulli shift* action over G with base space (K,κ). Let $\mathcal{P}_K=\{P_k:\ k\in K\}$ be the canonical partition where $P_k=\{x\in K^G:\ x(e)=k\}$. Then $\mathcal{P}_K$ is generating. However if G is non-amenable and $F \subset G$ is a large enough finite set, then $h_{\kappa^G}(T, \mathcal{P}_K) < h_\mu(T, \bigvee_{f \in F} f\mathcal{P}_K)$. In fact, it can be shown that $h_{\kappa^G}(T) = +\infty$ (unless (K, κ) is trivial). By contrast, if G is amenable then $h_{\kappa^G}(T) = H_{\kappa^G}(\mathcal{P}_K) < \infty$.

Sofic entropy theory is a generalization of the classical Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy theory initiated by the author [Bo10b] in the measure-theoretic setting. It was extended to the topological setting and developed further by D. Kerr and H. Li [KL11, KL2]. The main idea is to replace the Følner sequence from the amenable case with a sofic approximation. Thus sofic entropy quantifies the exponential growth rate of the number of "finite approximations" to the system. There are many different interpretations of the phrase "finite approximation" which lead to many different but equivalent definitions of sofic entropy. Indeed, we now have definitions based on partitions [Bo10b, Ke12], on topological models and pseudo-metrics [KL2], on sequences of L^∞ functions or continuous functions [KL11], on homomorphisms from $C(X)$ to $\mathbb{C}^d$ [KL11], and on open covers [Zh11].

In general, the sofic entropy of an action depends on a choice of sofic approximation, which naturally leads to the question "what is the best choice?" One approach to this question is to say that a good choice should satisfy various identities. For example, it should be additive under direct product, satisfy a subgroup formula and behave appropriately with respect to ergodic decompositions. In general, such identities do not hold. However, when the group G is a finitely generated free group then there is a *random* sofic approximation for which the corresponding sofic entropy, known as the f-invariant, satisfies these identities. This invariant was introduced in [Bo10a] via an explicit formula from which it is easily seen to be additive under direct products. In [Bo10c] it is shown to satisfy the analogue of Rohlin's formula, in [BG12] Yuzvinskii's addition formula, in [Se12a] a subgroup formula and in [Se12b] an ergodic decomposition formula. Moreover, in [Bo10d] it is shown that it is sofic entropy with respect to a random sofic approximation. Because of the importance of the f-invariant, we work with random sofic approximations in this paper.

In [RW00], Rudolph and Weiss proved the following. If, for $i = 1, 2$, G_i are countable amenable groups, $T_i : G_i \to \mathrm{Aut}(X, \mu)$ (for $i = 1, 2$) are free ergodic probability-measure-preserving actions with the same orbits and the cocycle $\alpha : G_1 \times X \to G_2$ defined by $\alpha(g, x) = h$ if $T_1(g)x = T_2(h)x$ is measurable with respect to the counting measures on

G_1, G_2 and a sub-sigma algebra $\mathcal{F}$ on X which is both $T_1(G_1)$ and $T_2(G_2)$-invariant then

$$h_\mu(T_1, \mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}) = h_\mu(T_2, \mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F})$$

for any finite partition $\mathcal{P}$. This implies that the relative entropy of a class-bijective extension of two discrete amenable measured equivalence relations is well-defined. This fact has proven to be very useful in extending classical results about $\mathbb{Z}$-actions to actions of arbitrary amenable groups [RW00, Da01, DP02, DG02, Av05, Av10]. Our main results expand on this work by defining relative entropy for extensions of sofic measured groupoids. Because groups and measured equivalence relations are special cases of measured groupoids, the results here extend many previous results.

The various definitions of entropy all depend (apriori) on the choice of an auxiliary object. In the classical case, the auxiliary object is the partition $\mathcal{P}$. This paper uses pseudo-metrics to define topology entropy. We also present two definitions of measure entropy: one based on a choice of sigma-algebra and the other based on a choice of pseudo-metric. The main results of §6-9 and of the paper are that these choices are irrelevant and the first and second definitions of measure entropy coincide (Theorems 6.7, 7.5, 9.5). Like the Kolomogorov-Sinai Theorem, these results are of fundamental importance to the theory because they show that one can compute or estimate entropy using whatever auxiliary object is most convenient.

Our definition of topological entropy is modeled after [KL2, Definition 2.3], our first definition of measure entropy is modeled after [Ke12] and our second definition of measure entropy is modeled after [KL2, Definition 3.3]. The proofs are independent of previous literature. While some aspects of the proofs follow [KL11, Ke12], other parts are new. In particular, we avoid the operator-theoretic point of view of [KL11]. The main advantage of our first definition of measure entropy is that it does not depend on a choice of topological model while our second definition is much more closely associated with the definition of topological entropy and, in particular, is useful in establishing the variational principle (Theorem 10.1).

Kolmogorov introduced entropy to dynamical systems theory in order to classify Bernoulli shift over the group $\mathbb{Z}$. In §11 we define Bernoulli shifts over an arbitrary discrete probability-measure-preserving groupoid and compute their entropy (Theorem 11.1), which as expected coincides with the Shannon entropy of the base space. This enables us to answer a question of Benjy Weiss on the isomorphism problem of non-free Bernoulli shifts (Theorem 12.2). The reader who is only interested in these two results need only read §2,3,4,7 for background.

1.1. **Organization.** We begin by defining groupoids in §2, sofic approximations in §3, extensions of groupoids in §4 and spanning and separating sets in §5. Sections §6 - 9 introduce the definitions of topological and measure sofic entropy and show that they do not depend on the choice of generating pseudo-metric or sigma-algebra. In §10 the variational principle is established. In §11 we compute the entropy of a Bernoulli shift. In §12 we show that two isomorphic non-free Bernoulli shifts with sofic stabilizer distribution must have the same base space entropy. The last two sections are independent of §5, 6, 8, 9, 10.

Acknowledgements. This paper owes a debt to David Kerr and Dykema-Kerr-Pichot for sharing early versions of [DKP11, Ke12] from which I learned a lot about sofic groupoids and the partition approach to sofic entropy. Thanks also to Hanfeng Li for finding errors in a previous version.

2. DISCRETE GROUPOIDS

A *groupoid* is a small category in which every morphism is invertible. More precisely, a groupoid is a set of morphisms, denoted by $\mathscr{H}^1$ together with a set of objects $\mathscr{H}^0$, source and range maps $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{r} : \mathscr{H}^1 \to \mathscr{H}^0$, an injective inclusion map $i : \mathscr{H}^0 \to \mathscr{H}^1$, a set of composable pairs $\mathscr{H}^2 \subset \mathscr{H}^1 \times \mathscr{H}^1$ and a composition map $c : \mathscr{H}^2 \to \mathscr{H}^1$ satisfying

1. $\mathfrak{s}(i(x)) = \mathfrak{r}(i(x)) = x$ for all $x \in \mathscr{H}^0$;
2. $\mathscr{H}^2 = \{(f,g) :\ \mathfrak{s}(f) = \mathfrak{r}(g)\}$;
3. $\mathfrak{s}(c(f,g)) = \mathfrak{s}(g), \mathfrak{r}(c(f,g)) = \mathfrak{r}(f)\ \forall (f,g) \in \mathscr{H}^2$,
4. for every $f \in \mathscr{H}^1$ there is a unique element, denoted $f^{-1} \in \mathscr{H}^1$ such that $c(f^{-1}, f) = i(\mathfrak{s}(f))$ and $c(f, f^{-1}) = i(\mathfrak{r}(f))$.

To simplify notation, we let $\mathscr{H}$ denote $\mathscr{H}^1$ and identify $\mathscr{H}^0$ as a subset of $\mathscr{H}$ via the inclusion map. If $(f,g) \in \mathscr{H}^2$ then we will write $fg := c(f,g)$. For example, the last item above can be expressed by $f^{-1}f = \mathfrak{s}(f)$ and $ff^{-1} = \mathfrak{r}(f)$.

A *measurable groupoid* is a groupoid $\mathscr{H}$ with the structure of a standard Borel space such that $\mathscr{H}^0$ is a Borel set and the source, range, composition, and inversion maps are all Borel.

Let $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ denote the set of all Borel subsets $f \subset \mathscr{H}$ such that the restrictions of the source and range maps to f are Borel isomorphisms onto their respective images. For $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, define $f^{-1} := \{h^{-1} : \ h \in f\}$. The composition of $f, g \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ is defined by $fg := \{h \in \mathscr{H} : \ h = f'g' \text{ for some } f' \in f, g' \in g\}$. This makes $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ an inverse semi-group called the *semi-group of partial automorphisms.* Observe that $\mathscr{H} \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and every Borel subset $P \subset \mathscr{H}^0$ is an element of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$. In particular, if $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $x \in \mathfrak{s}(f)$ then fx is well-defined. Moreover, $fx = \mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) \cap f$. Note that fx need not be in $\mathscr{H}^0$. To remedy this, we define $f \cdot x := \mathfrak{r}(fx) \in \mathscr{H}^0$. Similarly, if $P \subset \mathscr{H}^0$ then we define $f \cdot P := \mathfrak{r}(fP)$.

We let $[\mathscr{H}] \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ denote the space of all Borel subsets $f \subset \mathscr{H}$ such that the source and range maps restricted to f are each Borel isomorphisms onto $\mathscr{H}^0$. The set $[\mathscr{H}]$ is a group under composition. We call it the *full group* of $\mathscr{H}$.

A groupoid $\mathscr{H}$ is *discrete* if $\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x)$ and $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}(x)$ are countable for every $x \in \mathscr{H}^0$. A *discrete probability measured groupoid* is a discrete measurable groupoid $\mathscr{H}$ paired with a Borel probability measure ν on $\mathscr{H}^0$ such that if $\nu_\mathfrak{s}, \nu_\mathfrak{r}$ are the measures on $\mathscr{H}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\mathfrak{s}(B) &= \int_{\mathscr{H}^0} |\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) \cap B| \, d\nu(x) \\ \nu_\mathfrak{r}(B) &= \int_{\mathscr{H}^0} |\mathfrak{r}^{-1}(x) \cap B| \, d\nu(x) \end{aligned}$$

for every Borel set $B \subseteq \mathscr{H}$ then $\nu_\mathfrak{s}$ is equivalent to $\nu_\mathfrak{r}$. If, in addition, $\nu_\mathfrak{s} = \nu_\mathfrak{r}$ then we say $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ is *pmp (probability-measure-preserving).* In this article, we work exclusively with pmp groupoids. So we let ν denote $\nu_\mathfrak{s} = \nu_\mathfrak{r}$ and note that ν restricted to $\mathscr{H}^0$ is ν, so no confusion should arise.

A *discrete topological groupoid* is a discrete groupoid $\mathscr{H}$ so that $\mathscr{H}$ is equipped with a topology in which the structure maps (source, range, inverse and composition) are continuous. A *bisection* is an open subset $f \subset \mathscr{H}$ such that the source and range maps restricted to f are homeomorphisms onto their images which are open subsets of $\mathscr{H}^0$. We say that $\mathscr{H}$ is *étale* if every $g \in \mathscr{H}$ is contained in a bisection. Let us suppose now that $\mathscr{H}$ is a discrete topological groupoid.

Let $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ denote the set of all closed sets $f \subset \mathscr{H}$ such that the source and range maps restricted to f are homeomorphisms onto $\mathscr{H}^0$. This is a subgroup of $[\mathscr{H}]$.

Given a Borel set $A \subset \mathscr{H}^0$, let $\partial A = A \cap \overline{\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus A}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ be the collection of all Borel subsets $A \subset \mathscr{H}^0$ with $\nu(\partial A) = \nu(\partial(\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus A)) = 0$. We show in Lemma 8.4 that if $\mathscr{H}^0$ is compact and metrizable then $\mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ is a dense subalgebra of the measure algebra of $(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$. Let $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ be the set of all elements of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ of the form $f = \cup_{i=1}^n f_i$ where

- for each i there exists a bisection U_i with $f_i \subset U_i$,
- $\{\mathfrak{s}(f_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ are pairwise disjoint,
- $\{\mathfrak{r}(f_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ are pairwise disjoint.

This definition is designed in order to make our two different definitions of measure entropy agree (in §7 and 9); which is crucial to the proof of the variational principle.

Given $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, the *trace* of f is defined by $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(f) := \nu(\mathscr{H}^0 \cap f)$. Also we define $|f|_{\mathscr{H}} = \nu(f)$.

Example 2.1. A countable group G can thought of as a discrete pmp groupoid in which the set of objects $G^0 = \{e\}$. The measure ν is simply counting measure.

Example 2.2. Let G be a countable group with a probability measure-preserving action $G \curvearrowright (X, \lambda)$. The groupoid associated to this action is $\mathscr{H} = \{(g, x) :\ x \in X, g \in G\}$ where $\mathscr{H}^0 = \{(e, x) :\ x \in X\}$. The measure ν on $\mathscr{H}$ is defined to be $c \times \lambda$ where c is counting measure on G. The structure maps are defined by $\mathfrak{s}(g, x) = (e, x), \mathfrak{r}(g, x) = (e, gx)$, $(g, x)^{-1} = (g^{-1}, gx)$ and $(h, gx)(g, x) = (hg, x)$.

Example 2.3. Let G be a countable discrete group acting by homeomorphisms on a compact metric space X. The topological groupoid associated to this action is $\mathscr{H} = G \times X$ with the product topology. The structure maps are defined as in the previous example. Note that $\mathscr{H}$ is étale.

Example 2.4. Recall that a discrete pmp (probability measure-preserving) equivalence relation consists of a standard probability space (X, λ) together with Borel equivalence relation $E \subset X \times X$ such that every E-class is at most countable and, if c denotes the counting measure on X then $\lambda \times c|_E = c \times \lambda|_E$. This can be represented as a discrete pmp groupoid by setting $\mathscr{H} = E$, $\mathscr{H}^0 = \{(x, x) \in E :\ x \in X\}$ and $\nu = \lambda \times c|_E$. The structure maps are defined by $\mathfrak{s}(x, y) = (y, y), \mathfrak{r}(x, y) = (x, x), (x, y)^{-1} = (y, x)$ and $(x, y)(y, z) = (x, z)$.

Example 2.5. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. The *full groupoid* on $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ is $\Delta_d := \{1, \ldots, d\}^2$. The unit space is $\Delta_d^0 := \{(i, i) : \ 1 \leq i \leq d\}$. The structure maps are defined by $\mathfrak{s}(i, j) = (j, j), \mathfrak{r}(i, j) = (i, i), (i, j)^{-1} = (j, i)$ and $(i, j)(j, k) = (i, k)$. Let $\zeta_d(E) = |E|/d$ for every set $E \subset \Delta_d$. Thus (Δ_d, ζ_d) is a pmp groupoid. Note that $[\Delta_d]$ is isomorphic with the symmetric group on $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ while $[\![\Delta_d]\!]$ is the collection of all subsets $f \subset \Delta_d$ such that the two projection maps $\mathfrak{s} : f \to \mathfrak{s}(f), \mathfrak{r} : f \to \mathfrak{r}(f)$ are bijections. To make the notation simpler, we set $[d] := [\Delta_d]$, $[\![d]\!] := [\![\Delta_d]\!]$, $\mathrm{tr}_d := \mathrm{tr}_{\Delta_d}, |\cdot|_d := |\cdot|_{\Delta_d}$. So $\mathrm{tr}_d(f) = |f \cap \Delta_d^0|/d$ and $|f|_d = |f|/d$.

3. Sofic approximations

Let $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ be a pmp discrete groupoid. We use notation as in Example 2.5. For $d > 0$, let $\mathrm{Map}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!], [\![d]\!])$ be the set of all Borel maps from $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ to $[\![d]\!]$. This set carries a natural Borel structure as follows. Given a finite set $F \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, let $N(\sigma, F) = \{\sigma' \in \mathrm{Map}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!], [\![d]\!]) : \ \sigma'(f) = \sigma(f) \ \forall f \in F\}$. We consider $\mathrm{Map}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!], [\![d]\!])$ with the Borel structure generated by all such $N(\sigma, F)$.

Notation 3.1. We write $X \subset_f Y$ to mean "X is a finite subset of Y".

Let $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!], \delta > 0$. We say that a map $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ is (F, δ)-*multiplicative* if

$$|\sigma(st) \vartriangle \sigma(s)\sigma(t)|_d < \delta$$

for all $s, t \in F$ and (F, δ)-*trace-preserving* if

$$|\mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma(s)) - \mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(s)| < \delta.$$

for all $s \in F$.

Definition 3.1 (Sofic approximation)**.** Let J be a directed set. For each $j \in J$, let $d_j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{P}_j$ be a Borel probability measure on $\mathrm{Map}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!], [\![d_j]\!])$. We say that the family $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a *sofic approximation* to $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ if

(1) for every $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{j \to J} \mathbb{P}_j(\{\sigma \in \mathrm{Map}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!], [\![d_j]\!]) : \ \sigma \text{ is } (F, \delta)\text{-trace-preserving}\}) = 1.$$

(2) for every $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!], \delta > 0$, there exists $j \in J$ such that $j' \geq j$ implies $\mathbb{P}_{j'}$-almost every σ is (F, δ)-multiplicative.

(3) $\lim_{j \to J} d_j = +\infty$.

The groupoid $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ is *sofic* if it admits a sofic approximation. The next two lemmas are of basic general use.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be a pmp groupoid. For any $s,t,t',u \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$,*

$$|stu \vartriangle st'u|_{\mathscr{H}} \le |t \vartriangle t'|_{\mathscr{H}}.$$

Proof. This is an exercise. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $\delta > 0$. Suppose $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ is (F,δ)-multiplicative. Then for any Borel set $P \subset \mathscr{H}^0$ with $P \in F$ and any f with $f, f^{-1}, \mathfrak{s}(f), \mathfrak{r}(f) \in F$,*

1. $|\sigma(P) \vartriangle (\sigma(P) \cap \Delta^0_d)|_d \le \delta$;
2. $|\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \sigma(\mathfrak{s}(f))|_d \le 10\delta$;
3. $|\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f))|_d \le 10\delta$;
4. $|\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \sigma(f)^{-1}|_d \le 15\delta$.

Proof. Let $P \subset \mathscr{H}^0$ with $P \in F$. Note

$$\sigma(P) \setminus (\sigma(P) \cap \Delta^0_d) \subset \sigma(P) \setminus \sigma(P)\sigma(P).$$

To see this, observe that if $(j,i) \in \sigma(P) \setminus (\sigma(P) \cap \Delta^0_d)$ then $i \ne j$. If $(j,i) \in \sigma(P)\sigma(P)$ then there exists k such that $(j,k),(k,i) \in \sigma(P)$. Because $(k,i),(j,i) \in \sigma(P) \in [\![d]\!]$, we must have $j = k$. So $(j,j) \in \sigma(P)$ which implies (because $(j,i) \in \sigma(P)$) that $i = j$, a contradiction.

Because σ is (F,δ)-multiplicative,

$$|\sigma(P) \vartriangle (\sigma(P) \cap \Delta^0_d)|_d \le |\sigma(P) \vartriangle \sigma(P)\sigma(P)|_d = |\sigma(PP) \vartriangle \sigma(P)\sigma(P)|_d \le \delta.$$

This proves the first item.

Now let $f \in F$ be such that $f^{-1}, \mathfrak{s}(f), \mathfrak{r}(f) \in F$. Because σ is (F,δ)-multiplicative,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta &\ge |\sigma(f)\sigma(f^{-1})\sigma(f) \vartriangle \sigma(f)|_d \\ 2\delta &\ge |\sigma(f^{-1})\sigma(f)\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \sigma(f^{-1})|_d. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality above implies the range of $\sigma(f)$ is contained in the source of $\sigma(f^{-1})$ up to a 2δ-measure subset. The second inequality implies the range of $\sigma(f)$ contains the source of $\sigma(f^{-1})$ up to a 2δ-measure subset. Therefore,

$$|\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f^{-1})) \vartriangle \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f))|_d \le 4\delta.$$

Similar considerations imply $|\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f^{-1}))|_d \le 4\delta$.

Because of (F,δ)-multiplicativity, $|\sigma(f)\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f))|_d \le \delta$. Therefore, we have

$$|\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f)\sigma(f^{-1})) \vartriangle \mathfrak{s}(\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f)))|_d \le \delta.$$

Because $\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f^{-1}))$ is 4δ-close to $\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))$, it follows that $\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f)\sigma(f^{-1}))$ is 4δ-close to $\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f^{-1}))$ which is 4δ-close to $\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f))$. Thus

$$|\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \mathfrak{s}(\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f)))|_d \le 9\delta.$$

From item (1) it follows that $|\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f))) \vartriangle \sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f))|_d \le \delta$. So we obtain $|\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f))|_d \le 10\delta$. This proves item (3). Item (2) is similar.

We now have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \sigma(f)^{-1}|_d &\le |\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \sigma(f)^{-1}\sigma(f)\sigma(f^{-1})|_d + |\sigma(f)^{-1}\sigma(f)\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \sigma(f)^{-1}|_d \\
&\le \delta + |\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))\sigma(f^{-1})|_d + |\sigma(f)^{-1}\sigma(ff^{-1}) \vartriangle \sigma(f)^{-1}|_d \\
&\le 5\delta + |\sigma(f^{-1}) \vartriangle \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f^{-1}))\sigma(f^{-1})|_d + |\sigma(f)^{-1}\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f)) \vartriangle \sigma(f)^{-1}|_d \\
&\le 15\delta + |\sigma(f)^{-1}\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \sigma(f)^{-1}|_d = 15\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4. ACTIONS, EXTENSIONS AND FACTORS

Let $\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}$ be measurable groupoids. A map $\pi : \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ is a *groupoid morphism* if $\pi(fg) = \pi(f)\pi(g)$ for every $(f,g) \in \mathscr{G}^2$, $\pi(f)^{-1} = \pi(f^{-1})$ for every $f \in \mathscr{G}$ and $\pi(\mathscr{G}^0) \subset \mathscr{H}^0$. It is *class-bijective* if for every $a \in \mathscr{G}^0$, the restriction of π to $\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(a)$ is a bijection onto $\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(\pi(a))$ and the restriction of π to $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}(a)$ is also a bijection onto $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}(\pi(a))$. If π is also surjective then we say $\mathscr{G}$ is a *class-bijective extension* of $\mathscr{H}$ or, equivalently, $\mathscr{H}$ is a *class-bijective factor* of $\mathscr{G}$.

We say that π is *pmp (probability-measure-preserving)* if $\pi_*\mu = \nu$ and $(\mathscr{G},\mu), (\mathscr{H},\nu)$ are pmp groupoids.

If $\pi : (\mathscr{G},\mu) \to (\mathscr{H},\nu)$ is class-bijective then $\pi^{-1} : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![\mathscr{G}]\!]$ is a homomorphism. If $\mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{H}$ are topological groupoids, π is continuous and pmp then $\pi^{-1}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}) \subset [\![\mathscr{G}]\!]_{top}$. If π is understood then given $x \in \mathscr{G}$ and $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ we let fx denote $\pi^{-1}(f)x$. If $x \in \mathscr{G}^0$ then we let $f \cdot x$ denote $\mathfrak{r}(\pi^{-1}(f)x)$ $(= \mathfrak{r}(fx))$.

Example 4.1. Let G be a countable discrete group with pmp actions $G \curvearrowright (X,\mu)$ and $G \curvearrowright (Y,\nu)$. Suppose $\pi : X \to Y$ is a G-equivariant factor map (so $\pi_*\mu = \nu$). Then the groupoid associated to $G \curvearrowright (X,\mu)$ (as in Example 2.2) is a pmp class-bijective extension of the groupoid associated to $G \curvearrowright (Y,\nu)$. The case when Y is a single point is especially interesting because then the groupoid associated to $G \curvearrowright (Y,\nu)$ is identified with G itself. Therefore, class-bijective extensions of groupoids generalize group actions.

Example 4.2. The previous example can be generalized as follows. Let $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be a discrete pmp groupoid. Let $\alpha : \mathscr{H} \to \mathrm{Aut}(X,\lambda)$ be a measurable cocycle into the group of automorphisms of a standard probability space. This means that $\alpha(f)\alpha(g) = \alpha(fg)$ for any $(f,g) \in \mathscr{H}^2$. Associated to such a cocycle is a pmp class-bijective extension $\pi : (\mathscr{G},\mu) \to (\mathscr{H},\nu)$ defined as follows. Let $\mathscr{G} = \mathscr{H} \times X, \mathscr{G}^0 = \mathscr{H}^0 \times X, \mu = \nu \times \lambda$ with the structure maps defined by $\mathfrak{s}(h,x) = (\mathfrak{s}(h),x), \mathfrak{r}(h,x) = (\mathfrak{r}(h),\alpha(h)x), (h,x)^{-1} = (h^{-1},\alpha(h)x), (g,\alpha(h)x)(h,x) = (g,x)$ for $h,g \in \mathscr{H}, x \in X$. Let $\pi : \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ be projection onto the first coordinate. An exercise shows this is a pmp class-bijective extension.

We say two class-bijective extensions $\pi_i : (\mathscr{G}_i,\mu_i) \to (\mathscr{H}_i,\nu_i)$ $(i = 1,2)$ are *measure-isomorphic* if there exist measure-preserving isomorphisms $\Phi : (\mathscr{G}_1,\mu_1) \to (\mathscr{G}_2,\mu_2)$ and $\Psi : (\mathscr{H}_1,\nu_1) \to (\mathscr{H}_2,\nu_2)$ such that $\pi_2\Phi = \Psi\pi_1$ almost everywhere. Similarly, two continuous class-bijective extensions $\pi_i : \mathscr{G}_i \to \mathscr{H}_i$ $(i = 1,2)$ are *isomorphic* if there exist continuous isomorphisms $\Phi : \mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{G}_2$ and $\Psi : \mathscr{H}_1 \to \mathscr{H}_2$ such that $\pi_2\Phi = \Psi\pi_1$.

5. Spanning and separating sets

We use spanning and separating sets as a tool to define the topological entropy of a continuous class-bijective groupoid extension in the next section. Here we set notation and obtain a well-known result. Recall that a pseudo-metric ρ on a set X possesses all the properties of a metric except nondegeneracy: it can happen that $x \neq y \in X$ but $\rho(x,y) = 0$.

Definition 5.1. Given a pseudo-metric space (Z,ρ) and $\epsilon > 0$, a subset $Y \subset Z$ is (ρ,ϵ)-*separated* if for every $y_1 \neq y_2 \in Y$ $\rho(y_1,y_2) > \epsilon$. For $X \subset Z$, let $N_\epsilon(X,\rho)$ denote the maximum cardinality of a (ρ,ϵ)-separated subset $Y \subset X$.

Let $X, Y \subset Z$. We say Y (ρ, ϵ)-*spans* X if for every $x \in X$ there exists $y \in Y$ with $\rho(x, y) < \epsilon$. Let $N'_\epsilon(X, \rho)$ denote the minimum cardinality of a set $Y \subset Z$ which (ρ, ϵ)-spans X. This number implicitly depends on Z.

Lemma 5.2. *For any pseudo-metric space* (Z, ρ)*,* $X \subset Z$*,* $\epsilon > 0$*,*

$$N'_{2\epsilon}(X, \rho) \le N_\epsilon(X, \rho) \le N'_{\epsilon/2}(X, \rho).$$

Proof. Let $Y_1 \subset X$ be a maximal (ρ, ϵ)-separated subset. Then Y_1 $(\rho, 2\epsilon)$-spans X. Therefore $N'_{2\epsilon}(X, \rho) \le N_\epsilon(X, \rho)$.

Let $Y_2 \subset Z$ be a minimal $(\rho, \epsilon/2)$-spanning subset for X. Then the $\epsilon/2$-neighborhood of any point $y \in Y_2$ contains at most 1 point of Y_1. Moreover, every point of Y_1 is contained in the $\epsilon/2$-neighborhood of some point of Y_2. Therefore $|Y_2| \ge |Y_1|$ which implies $N_\epsilon(X, \rho) \le N'_{\epsilon/2}(X, \rho)$.

□

6. Topological entropy

We assume as given: two discrete separable topological groupoids $\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}$ such that $\mathscr{G}^0$ and $\mathscr{H}^0$ are compact metrizable spaces, a continuous class-bijective factor map $\pi : \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$, a Borel probability measure ν on $\mathscr{H}$ making $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ a pmp groupoid, a sofic approximation $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_j\}_{j \in J}$ to $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$, a bias β (defined below) and a number $p \in [1, \infty]$. From this and a choice of generating pseudo-metric, we will define the *sofic topological entropy of* π *with respect to* $(\mathbb{P}, p, \beta)$.

Given an integer $d > 0$, we will write $x \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ as $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$. Given $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, we let $f \cdot x := (f \cdot x_1, \ldots, f \cdot x_d)$. If $\pi(x_i) \notin \mathfrak{s}(f)$ then $f \cdot x_i$ is not defined. In this case, we set $f \cdot x_i := *$ where $*$ is a special symbol. Thus $f \cdot x \in (\mathscr{G}^0 \cup \{*\})^d$.

For ease of notation, we will identify Δ^0_d with $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ and, for $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ we will write $\sigma(f)i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ instead of $\sigma(f) \cdot i$. With x as above, we define $x \circ \sigma(f) := (x_{\sigma(f)1}, \ldots, x_{\sigma(f)d})$. If $i \notin \mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))$ then $x_{\sigma(f)i}$ is not well-defined. In this case, we set $x_{\sigma(f)i} := *$. So $x \circ \sigma(f) \in (\mathscr{G}^0 \cup \{*\})^d$.

Let ρ be a continuous pseudo-metric on $\mathscr{G}^0$. We extend ρ to $\mathscr{G}^0 \cup \{*\}$ by setting $\rho(*,*) = 0$ and $\rho(*,x) = \max\{\rho(y,z) :\ y,z \in \mathscr{G}^0\}$ for any $x \in \mathscr{G}^0$. This induces pseudo-metrics on the d-fold Cartesian product of $\mathscr{G}^0 \cup \{*\}$ by

$$\rho_2(x,x') := \left(\frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^d \rho(x_i,x_i')^2\right)^{1/2}, \quad \rho_\infty(x,x') := \max_{1\le i\le d} \rho(x_i,x_i').$$

Definition 6.1 (Approximate partial orbits)**.** Let $C(\mathscr{H}^0)$ denote the space of continuous complex-valued functions on $\mathscr{H}^0$. Given a map $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, finite sets $F \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, $K \subset C(\mathscr{H}^0)$ and $\delta > 0$, we let $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho)$ be the set of all d-tuples $(x_1,\ldots,x_d)$ (with $x_i \in \mathscr{G}^0$) such that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \delta & > & \rho_2(f\cdot x, x\circ\sigma(f)) \quad \forall f \in F, \\ \delta & > & \left| d^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^d k(\pi(x_i)) - \int k\ d\nu \right| \quad \forall k \in K. \end{array}$$

Definition 6.2. A *bias* β for J is either an element of $\{-,+\}$ or a nonprincipal ultrafilter on J. Given a function $\Phi : J \to \mathbb{R}$, if β is an ultrafilter then the ultralimit $\lim_{j\to\beta}\Phi(j)$ is well-defined. Otherwise, define

$$\lim_{j\to\beta}\Phi(j) := \begin{cases} \liminf_{j\to J}\Phi(j) & \text{if } \beta = - \\ \limsup_{j\to J}\Phi(j) & \text{if } \beta = + \end{cases}$$

Notation 6.1. Given a function ϕ on $\mathrm{Map}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!],[\![d_j]\!])$, we let $\|\phi\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}$ denote the L^p norm of ϕ with respect to $\mathbb{P}_j$. For example, if $1 \le p < \infty$ then

$$\|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} = \left(\int N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_2)^p\ d\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma)\right)^{1/p}.$$

Definition 6.3. Recall that we write $X \subset_f Y$ to mean that X is a finite subset of Y. Define

$$h^\beta_{\mathbb{P},p}(\pi,\rho,2) := \sup_{\epsilon>0}\inf_{\delta>0}\inf_{F\subset_f[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}}\inf_{K\subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)}\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j};$$

$$h^\beta_{\mathbb{P},p}(\pi,\rho,\infty) := \sup_{\epsilon>0}\inf_{\delta>0}\inf_{F\subset_f[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}}\inf_{K\subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)}\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.$$

Remark 6.2. For most of the paper, the choices of p and β are irrelevant. Therefore, we will write $h_\mathbb{P}(\pi,\rho,2)$ instead of $h^\beta_{\mathbb{P},p}(\pi,\rho,2)$ and $h_\mathbb{P}(\pi,\rho,\infty)$ instead of $h^\beta_{\mathbb{P},p}(\pi,\rho,\infty)$, leaving p and β implicit. The order of the supremums, infimums and limits above is important with the exception that one can permute the three infimums without affecting the definition.

Remark 6.3. There is a certain useful monotonicity phenomenon in the formulas above: the quantity

$$\frac{1}{d_j}\log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}$$

is monotone increasing in δ and monotone decreasing in ϵ, F, K (subsets are ordered by inclusion). Therefore, the infimums and the supremum can be replaced by the appropriate (directed) limits. In the sequel, we will use these facts without explicit reference. Similar statements hold true if ρ_2 is replaced with ρ_∞ or N_ϵ is replaced with N'_ϵ.

Lemma 6.4. *If we replace $N_\epsilon(\cdot)$ in the definitions above with $N'_\epsilon(\cdot)$ then we obtain equivalent definitions. More precisely,*

$$h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) = \sup_{\epsilon>0}\inf_{\delta>0}\inf_{F\subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}}\inf_{K\subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)}\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j};$$

$$h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,\infty) = \sup_{\epsilon>0}\inf_{\delta>0}\inf_{F\subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}}\inf_{K\subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)}\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.$$

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 5.2. □

Lemma 6.5. *In general, $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) = h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,\infty)$.*

Proof. First note that $\rho_2 \le \rho_\infty$. Therefore, any (ρ_2,ϵ)-separated subset is (ρ_∞,ϵ)-separated which implies

$$N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_2) \le N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_\infty)$$

for any σ, F, K, δ. Thus $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) \le h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,\infty)$.

To prove the other direction, let $1/10 > \epsilon > 0$ and let M be a $(\rho,\sqrt{\epsilon})$-spanning subset of $\mathscr{G}^0$ of minimum cardinality. Let $\delta > 0, F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, $K \subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)$, $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ and $Y \subset (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ be a (ρ_2,ϵ)-spanning set for $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho)$ of minimum cardinality. For ease of notation, let $\eta = \lceil \epsilon d\rceil$. Define $Y' \subset (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ as follows. For $y \in Y$, every set $\Lambda \subset [d]$ of cardinality η and every map $\phi : \Lambda \to M$ define $y^\phi \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ by

$$y^\phi_i = \begin{cases} y_i & \text{if } i \notin \Lambda \\ \phi(i) & \text{if } i \in \Lambda \end{cases}$$

Let Y' be the set of all y^ϕ over all such $y \in Y$ and $\phi : \Lambda \to M$. Observe that

$$|Y'| \le |Y| \binom{d}{\eta} |M|^\eta.$$

We claim that Y' is $(\rho_\infty, \sqrt{\epsilon})$-spanning for $Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$. To see this, let $z \in Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$. Because Y is (ρ_2, ϵ)-spanning for $Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$, there is a $y \in Y$ such that $\rho_2(y, z) \le \epsilon$. I.e.,

$$\epsilon^2 \ge \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \rho(y_i, z_i)^2.$$

Therefore, there exists a set $\Lambda \subset [d]$ such that for $i \notin \Lambda$, $\rho(y_i, z_i) \le \sqrt{\epsilon}$ and $|\Lambda| = \eta$. By definition of M, for every $i \in \Lambda$ there is a point $\phi(i) \in M$ such that $\rho(\phi(i), z_i) \le \sqrt{\epsilon}$. Therefore, $\rho_\infty(y^\phi, z) \le \sqrt{\epsilon}$. This proves the claim: Y' is $(\rho_\infty, \sqrt{\epsilon})$-spanning for $Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$.

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty) &\le |Y'| \le |Y| \binom{d}{\eta} |M|^\eta \\ &= N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_2) \binom{d}{\lceil \epsilon d \rceil} |M|^{\lceil \epsilon d \rceil}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Stirling's approximation that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \| N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty) \|_{p, \mathbb{P}_j} \\ \le \; & \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \| N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_2) \|_{p, \mathbb{P}_j} \\ & + 2\epsilon \log(|M|) - 2\epsilon \log(2\epsilon) - (1 - 2\epsilon) \log(1 - 2\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.4 it follows that $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho, 2) \ge h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho, \infty)$. □

Because of the lemma above, we will write $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho)$ to denote either $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho, 2)$ or $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho, \infty)$. If we need to specify β and p then we denote this quantity by $h^\beta_{\mathbb{P},p}(\pi, \rho)$.

Definition 6.6. A pseudo-metric ρ on $\mathscr{G}^0$ is *dynamically generating* for $\pi : \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ if for every $x, y \in \mathscr{G}^0$ there exists $f \in [\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ such that $\rho(f \cdot x, f \cdot y) > 0$. Note that we are using $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ instead of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ to define this property.

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 6.7. *If* ρ_1, ρ_2 *are dynamically generating continuous pseudo-metrics on* $\mathscr{G}^0$ *then* $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho_1) = h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho_2)$.

Remark 6.4. The proof of Theorem 6.7 uses only properties (2) and (3) of the definition of sofic approximation (Definition 3.1). Moreover, it does not use the full definition of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$. We only need to use the fact that $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ is closed under composition and $[\mathscr{H}]_{top} \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$.

Definition 6.8. Given Theorem 6.7, we define the *sofic topological entropy of* π *with respect to* $(\mathbb{P}, p, \beta)$ by $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi) := h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho) = h^{\beta}_{\mathbb{P},p}(\pi, \rho)$ where ρ is any dynamically generating continuous pseudo-metric on $\mathscr{G}^0$. Intuitively, this is the relative entropy with respect to the measure ν. Because the sofic approximation $\mathbb{P}$ determines ν, ν is implicitly referenced in the notation.

Lemma 6.9. *If* ρ, ρ' *are continuous metrics on* $\mathscr{G}^0$ *then* $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho) = h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho')$.

Proof. Because ρ and ρ' are continuous metrics and $\mathscr{G}^0$ is compact, for every $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large integer $n \gg 0$ there exist $\delta_0, \epsilon_n > 0$ such that

1. $\rho'(x, y) \le \sqrt{\delta_0} \Rightarrow \rho(x, y) \le \delta$,
2. $\delta_0 \le \delta^2$,
3. $\rho'(x, y) \ge \epsilon_n \Rightarrow \rho(x, y) \ge 1/n$,
4. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon_n = 0$.

Let $M = \max\{\rho(x, y) : \ x, y \in \mathscr{G}^0\}$ be the diameter of ρ.

Claim 1. For any $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ and $K \subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)$,

$$Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta_0, \rho') \subset Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta(M^2 + 1)^{1/2}, \rho).$$

Proof of Claim 1. Let $z \in Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta_0, \rho')$ and $f \in F$. By definition,

$$\rho'_2(f \cdot z, z \circ \sigma(f)) = \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \rho'(f \cdot z_i, z_{\sigma(f)i})^2 \right)^{1/2} < \delta_0.$$

So there exists a set $\Lambda = \Lambda(z, f, \sigma) \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that

1. $|\Lambda| \le \delta_0 d$;
2. for every $i \notin \Lambda$, $\rho'(f \cdot z_i, z_{\sigma(f)i}) \le \sqrt{\delta_0}$, which implies $\rho(f \cdot z_i, z_{\sigma(f)i}) \le \delta$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_2(f\cdot z, z\circ\sigma_f)^2 &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{d}\rho(f\cdot z_i, z_{\sigma(f)i})^2 \le \frac{|\Lambda|}{d}M^2 + \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i\notin\Lambda}\rho(f\cdot z_i, z_{\sigma(f)i})^2 \\ &\le \delta_0 M^2 + \frac{d-|\Lambda|}{d}\delta^2 \le \delta^2(M^2+1).\end{aligned}$$

Because $f\in F$ is arbitrary, $z\in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta(M^2+1)^{1/2},\rho)$. Because z is arbitrary, this implies the claim. □

By choice of ϵ_n,

$$N_{\epsilon_n}(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta_0,\rho'),\rho'_\infty) \le N_{1/n}(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta(M^2+1)^{1/2},\rho),\rho_\infty).$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N_{\epsilon_n}(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta_0,\rho'),\rho'_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} \\ \le\ &\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N_{1/n}(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta(M^2+1)^{1/2},\rho),\rho_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over $\delta_0>0$, then over all $\delta>0$ then over all $F\subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ and $K\subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)$, then the supremum over all n (and using that $\epsilon_n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$) we obtain $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho')\le h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho)$. Because ρ' and ρ are arbitrary, this implies the lemma. □

Definition 6.10. Given a pseudo-metric ρ on $\mathscr{G}^0$ and a sequence $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ with $\phi_i\in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$, define a pseudo-metric ρ^ϕ on $\mathscr{G}^0$ by

$$\rho^\phi(x,y) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty 2^{-i}\rho(\phi_i\cdot x,\phi_i\cdot y)^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

Definition 6.11. Let m be a continuous metric on $\mathscr{G}^0$ and define a metric $\overline{m}$ on $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ by $\overline{m}(f,g)=\sup_{x\in\mathscr{H}^0} m(f\cdot x, g\cdot x)$. The topology that this induces on $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ is independent of the choice of metric m.

Lemma 6.12. *Consider the homeomorphism group of $\mathscr{G}^0$, $Homeo(\mathscr{G}^0)$, with the topology of pointwise convergence. We equip $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ with the topology it inherits as a subgroup of $Homeo(\mathscr{G}^0)$. If ρ is a continuous dynamically generating pseudo-metric and $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a dense subset of $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$, then ρ^ϕ is a continuous metric.*

Proof. It is clear that ρ^ϕ is a continuous pseudo-metric. So it suffices to show that for any $x, y \in \mathscr{G}^0$ with $x \neq y$, $\rho^\phi(x, y) > 0$. Because ρ is dynamically generating, there is an $f \in [\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ such that $\rho(f \cdot x, f \cdot y) > 0$. Because $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is dense in $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ and ρ is continuous, there exists an i such that

$$\max(\rho(\phi_i \cdot x, f \cdot x), \rho(\phi_i \cdot y, f \cdot y)) < \rho(f \cdot x, f \cdot y)/3.$$

Therefore,

$$\rho(\phi_i \cdot x, \phi_i \cdot y) \geq \rho(f \cdot x, f \cdot y) - \rho(\phi_i \cdot x, f \cdot x) - \rho(\phi_i \cdot y, f \cdot y) \geq \rho(f \cdot x, f \cdot y)/3 > 0.$$

Thus $\rho^\phi(x, y) \geq 2^{-i}\rho(f \cdot x, f \cdot y)/3 > 0$. Because x, y are arbitrary, this establishes that ρ^ϕ is a metric as claimed. □

Remark 6.5. The reason our definition of generating pseudo-metric uses $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ instead of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ (or other possible choices) is that, if $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ then ρ^ϕ is not necessarily continuous, but if $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset [\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ then ρ^ϕ is continuous.

Lemma 6.13. *Let ρ be a continuous dynamically generating pseudo-metric and let $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a subset of $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ with $\phi_1 = \mathscr{H}^0$. Then*

$$h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho) = h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho^\phi).$$

Proof. **Claim 1**. For any $x, y \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$,

$$\rho_2^\phi(x, y)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{-j}\rho_2(\phi_j \cdot x, \phi_j \cdot y)^2.$$

Proof of Claim 1. This is a straightforward computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_2^\phi(x, y)^2 &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^d \rho^\phi(x_i, y_i)^2 = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^d\sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{-j}\rho(\phi_j \cdot x_i, \phi_j \cdot y_i)^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{-j}\frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^d \rho(\phi_j \cdot x_i, \phi_j \cdot y_i)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{-j}\rho_2(\phi_j \cdot x, \phi_j \cdot y)^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Because $\phi_1 = \mathscr{H}^0$, $\rho \leq 2\rho^\phi$. So

$$Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho^\phi) \subset Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, 2\delta, \rho)$$

for any σ, F, K, δ.

We are going to use spanning sets, but there is one technical issue. A spanning set for a given set Y is not required to be contained in Y. To remedy this we show:

Claim 2. There exists a $(\rho_2, 2\epsilon)$-spanning set Y for $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,2\delta,\rho)$ which is contained in $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,2\delta,\rho)$ and satisfies $|Y| \le N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,2\delta,\rho))$.

Proof of Claim 2. Let Y' be a minimal (ρ_2,ϵ)-spanning set for $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,2\delta,\rho)$. Because Y' is minimal, for each $y' \in Y'$ there exists an element $y \in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,2\delta,\rho)$ with $\rho_2(y,y') < \epsilon$. The collection Y of all of these elements satisfies the claim. □

Let M be the diameter of $(\mathscr{G}^0, \rho)$. Let F_n be any finite subset of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ containing $\{\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_n\}$. If $1 \le i \le n$ and $x, y \in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho)$ satisfy $\rho_2(x,y) < 2\epsilon$ then

$$\rho_2(\phi_i\cdot x, \phi_i \cdot y) \quad\le\quad \rho_2(x\circ\sigma(\phi_i), y\circ\sigma(\phi_i)) + \rho_2(x\circ\sigma(\phi_i), \phi_i\cdot x) + \rho_2(y\circ\sigma(\phi_i),\phi_i\cdot y) < 2\epsilon + 4\delta.$$

We have used there that $\rho_2(x\circ\sigma(\phi_i), y\circ\sigma(\phi_i)) \le \rho_2(x,y)$. So,

$$\rho_2^\phi(x,y)^2 \quad=\quad \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{-j}\rho_2(\phi_j x, \phi_j y)^2 < 2^{-n}M^2 + (2\epsilon+4\delta)^2.$$

By Claim 2, there exists a $(\rho_2, 2\epsilon)$-spanning set Y for $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho)$ which is contained in $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho)$ and satisfies $|Y| \le N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho))$. So for any $x \in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho)$ there exists $y \in Y$ with $\rho_2(x,y) < 2\epsilon$ which implies $\rho_2^\phi(x,y)^2 < 2^{-n}M^2 + (2\epsilon+4\delta)^2$. Thus Y is $(\rho_2^\phi, \sqrt{2^{-n}M^2+(2\epsilon+4\delta)^2})$-spanning. Letting $\eta = \sqrt{2^{-n}M^2+(2\epsilon+4\delta)^2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho),\rho_2) \ge N'_\eta((Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho),\rho_2^\phi) \\ \ge\quad & N'_\eta((Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,\delta,\rho^\phi),\rho_2^\phi) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the inclusion $Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,\delta,\rho^\phi) \subset Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho)$. By monotonicity, if n is large enough and δ is small enough then $3\epsilon > \eta$ which implies

$$N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,2\delta,\rho),\rho_2) \ge N'_{3\epsilon}((Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_n,K,\delta,\rho^\phi),\rho_2^\phi).$$

Because F_n is any finite subset of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ containing $\{\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_n\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\delta>0}\inf_{F\subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}}\inf_{K\subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)}\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,2\delta,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} \\ \ge\quad & \inf_{\delta>0}\inf_{F\subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}}\inf_{K\subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)}\lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\|N'_{3\epsilon}(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho^\phi),\rho_2^\phi)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for every $\epsilon > 0$, we have $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho, 2) \geq h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho^{\phi}, 2)$ which implies $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho) \geq h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho^{\phi})$.

Claim 3. Given any finite $F \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ with $\mathscr{H}^0 \in F$ and $\delta > 0$, if n is sufficiently large, $F' = \{\phi_j f : \ f \in F, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ and σ is $(F', \delta^2/M^2)$-multiplicative then

$$Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, 2\delta, \rho^{\phi}) \supset Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F', K, \delta, \rho).$$

Proof of Claim 3. Let n be large enough so that $(3\delta)^2 + 2^{-n}M^2 \leq (4\delta)^2$. Then for any $f \in F$ and j with $1 \leq j \leq n$, if σ is $(F', \delta^2/M^2)$-multiplicative and $x \in Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F', K, \delta, \rho)$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_2(\phi_j f \cdot x, \phi_j(x \circ \sigma(f))) \quad &\leq \quad \rho_2(\phi_j f \cdot x, x \circ \sigma(\phi_j f)) + \rho_2(x \circ \sigma(\phi_j f), x \circ \sigma(\phi_j)\sigma(f)) \\ &\quad + \rho_2(x \circ \sigma(\phi_j)\sigma(f), (\phi_j \cdot x) \circ \sigma(f)) \leq 3\delta.\end{aligned}$$

This calculation relies on two easily verified facts: $\phi_j(x \circ \sigma(f)) = (\phi_j x) \circ \sigma(f)$ and $\rho_2(x \circ \sigma(\phi_j)\sigma(f), (\phi_j x) \circ \sigma(f)) \leq \rho_2(x \circ \sigma(\phi_j), (\phi_j x))$. Thus

$$\rho_2^{\phi}(f \cdot x, x \circ \sigma(f))^2 \quad = \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \rho_2(\phi_j f \cdot x, \phi_j(x \circ \sigma(f)))^2 \leq (3\delta)^2 + 2^{-n}M^2 < 4\delta^2.$$

This implies the claim. □

Recall that $\rho \leq 2\rho^{\phi}$. So when Claim 3 holds,

$$N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, 2\delta, \rho^{\phi}), \rho^{\phi}_\infty) \geq N'_{2\epsilon}(Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F', K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty).$$

Thus

$$\lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N'_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, 2\delta, \rho^{\phi}), \rho^{\phi}_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} \geq \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N'_{2\epsilon}(Orb_\nu(\pi, \cdot, F', K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}$$

which implies $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho^{\phi}) \geq h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho)$. Because we obtained the reverse inequality above, this proves the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 6.7. Because $\mathscr{G}^0$ is compact and metrizable, $Homeo(\mathscr{G}^0)$ is separable and metrizable (with respect to the topology of pointwise convergence). Therefore $[\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ is also separable. So there exists a dense sequence $\phi = \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset [\mathscr{H}]_{top}$ with $\phi_1 = \mathscr{H}^0$. By Lemmas 6.13, 6.12, 6.9, $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho_1) = h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho_1^{\phi}) = h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho_2^{\phi}) = h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi, \rho_2)$. □

7. Measure entropy via partitions

In this section, we define measure sofic entropy for groupoid extensions in a manner analogous to [Ke12]. So let $\pi : (\mathscr{G},\mu) \to (\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be a class-bijective extension of pmp discrete groupoids and $\mathbb{P} := \{\mathbb{P}_j\}_{j\in J}$ a sofic approximation to $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$.

Given a finite partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathscr{G}^0$ and a finite set $F \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, let $\mathcal{P}^F$ be the coarsest partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$ containing $\{f\cdot P :\ f\in F, P\in\mathcal{P}\}$. Also let $\Sigma(\mathcal{P})$ be the smallest sigma-algebra of $\mathscr{G}^0$ containing $\mathcal{P}$. Let $\mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ be the set of all subsets of Δ^0_d. Of course, $\mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ is a sigma-algebra.

A map $\phi : \Sigma(\mathcal{P}) \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ is a *homomorphism* if for every $A,B\in\Sigma(\mathcal{P})$, $\phi(A\cup B) = \phi(A)\cup\phi(B)$, $\phi(A\cap B)=\phi(A)\cap\phi(B)$ and $\phi(\mathscr{G}^0)=\Delta^0_d$.

Definition 7.1 (Good homomorphisms). Given $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ and $f\in[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, we let σ_f denote $\sigma(f)$. Given $\delta>0$ and $F\subset[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, let $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)$ be the set of all homomorphisms $\phi : \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F)\to\mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ such that

(1) $\sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} |\sigma_f\cdot\phi(P)\vartriangle\phi(f\cdot P)|d^{-1} < \delta \quad \forall f\in F$;

(2) $\sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}^F} ||\phi(P)|d^{-1} - \mu(P)| < \delta$.

Definition 7.2. Given a partition $\mathcal{Q}$ of $\mathscr{G}^0$ with $\mathcal{Q}\le\mathcal{P}$, let $|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}}$ be the cardinality of the set of homomorphisms $\phi:\Sigma(\mathcal{Q})\to\mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ such that there exists a $\phi'\in\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)$ so that ϕ is the restriction of ϕ' to $\Sigma(\mathcal{Q})$.

Definition 7.3. For the definitions below, recall the definitions of $\lim_{j\to\beta}$, $\|\cdot\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}$ and $X\subset_f Y$ from the beginning of §6. In particular, choose a bias β and $p\in[1,\infty]$. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$ denote the Borel sigma-algebra of $\mathscr{G}^0$. Given finite Borel partitions $\mathcal{Q}\le\mathcal{P}$ and a sub-algebra $\mathcal{F}\subset\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$ define

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P},F,\delta) &:= \lim_{j\to\beta}\frac{1}{d_j}\log\||\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\cdot,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}}\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}\\
h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P}) &:= \inf_{F\subset_f[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]}\inf_{\delta>0} h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P},F,\delta)\\
h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{F}) &:= \inf_{\mathcal{Q}\le\mathcal{P}\subset\mathcal{F}} h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P})\\
h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{F}) &:= \sup_{\mathcal{Q}\subset\mathcal{F}} h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{F}).
\end{aligned}$$

The infimum in the second-to-last line is over all finite Borel partitions $\mathcal{P}$ with $\mathcal{Q}\le\mathcal{P}\subset\mathcal{F}$ and the supremum in the last line is over all finite partitions $\mathcal{Q}\subset\mathcal{F}$. The *sofic measure entropy* of π (with respect to $\mathbb{P},p,\beta$) is $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) := h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0))$.

Remark 7.1. Of course, $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi)$ depends implicity on $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and a bias β. Whenever we want to the emphasize this dependence, we will write $h^{\beta}_{\mathbb{P},p,\mu}(\pi)$ instead of $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi)$ and similarly for the other quantities above.

Remark 7.2. The order of the supremums, infimums and limits above is important with the exception that one can permute the three infimums without affecting the definition of $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F})$.

Remark 7.3. There is a certain useful monotonicity phenomenon in the formulas above: the quantity

$$\frac{1}{d_j} \log \| |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}$$

is monotone increasing in $\delta, \mathcal{Q}$ and monotone decreasing in $F, \mathcal{P}$ (subsets are partially ordered by inclusion and partitions are partially ordered by refinement). Therefore, the infimums and the supremum can be replaced by the appropriate (directed) limits. In the sequel, we will use these facts without explicit reference.

Definition 7.4. Given a sub-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathscr{G}^0$, let $\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{F})$ be the smallest sigma-algebra such that for every $P \in \mathcal{F}$ and $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, $f \cdot P \in \Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{F})$. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is *π-generating* if $\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{F})$ is the full Borel sigma-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$ (up to sets of measure zero).

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving:

Theorem 7.5. *If $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$ is π-generating, then $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{F})$.*

Remark 7.4. The proof of Theorem 7.5 uses only properties (2) and (3) in the definition of sofic approximation (Definition 3.1).

Lemma 7.6. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a finite partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for every sub-algebra $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$ with $\max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \inf_{B \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(P \bigtriangleup B) < \delta$ there exists a homomorphism $\phi : \Sigma(\mathcal{P}) \to \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $\mu(\phi(P) \bigtriangleup P) < \epsilon$ for all $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_n\}$ and choose $\delta > 0$ so that $3n^3\delta < \epsilon$. Suppose there is a map $\psi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{S}$ such that $\mu(P \bigtriangleup \psi(P)) < \delta$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. For $1 \leq i < n$ define

$$\phi(P_i) = \psi(P_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j<i} \psi(P_j).$$

Set $\phi(P_n) = \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \psi(P_i)$. Note that $\phi(\mathcal{P})$ is a partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$ so there is a unique way to extend ϕ to $\Sigma(\mathcal{P})$ so that it is a homomorphism. For any $i \neq j$,

$$\mu(\psi(P_i) \cap \psi(P_j)) \le \mu(P_i \cap P_j) + 2\delta = 2\delta.$$

So for $1 \le i < n$,

$$\mu(\phi(P_i) \vartriangle P_i) \le \mu(\psi(P_i) \vartriangle P_i) + 2n\delta \le 3n\delta.$$

Also

$$\mu(\phi(P_n) \vartriangle P_n) \le \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mu(\phi(P_i) \vartriangle P_i) \le 3n^2\delta.$$

Because any $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P})$ is a union of at most n elements of $\mathcal{P}$, we have

$$\mu(\phi(P) \vartriangle P) \le 3n^3\delta < \epsilon \quad \forall P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}).$$

□

Definition 7.7. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$. On the set of all homomorphisms from some sub-algebra containing $\mathcal{Q}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$ to $\mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ we define the pseudo-metric

$$\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi, \psi) = \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} d^{-1} |\phi(Q) \vartriangle \psi(Q)|.$$

Given a set K of homomorphisms, let $N_\epsilon(K, \rho_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be the maximum cardinality of a $(\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}, \epsilon)$-separated subset. For $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \delta, F) &:= \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N_\epsilon(\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta), \rho_{\mathcal{Q}})\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} \\
h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \delta) &:= \inf_{F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]} h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \delta, F) \\
h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) &:= \inf_{\delta > 0} h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \delta) \\
h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}) &:= \inf_{\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{F}} h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \\
h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{F}) &:= \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{F}} h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}).
\end{aligned}$$

The infimum in the second-to-last line is over all finite Borel partitions $\mathcal{P}$ with $\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and the supremum in the last line is over all finite partitions $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 7.8. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite measurable partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$ and let $\kappa > 0$. Then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \le h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) + \kappa$ for all finite measurable partitions $\mathcal{P}$ refining $\mathcal{Q}$.*

Proof. The key observation is that for any $A \subset \Delta^0_d$ the number of sets $B \subset \Delta^0_d$ with $|A \vartriangle B|_d \le \epsilon$ is at most $\binom{d}{\lfloor \epsilon d \rfloor}$, which, by Stirling's approximation, is at most $e^{\kappa d/|\mathcal{Q}|}$ if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Therefore, if $\phi : \Sigma(\mathcal{Q}) \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ is any homomorphism, then the set of all homomorphisms $\psi : \Sigma(\mathcal{Q}) \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ such that $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi, \psi) \le \epsilon$ has cardinality at most $\binom{d}{\lceil \epsilon d \rceil}^{|\mathcal{Q}|} \le \exp(\kappa d)$ if ϵ is sufficiently small. In this case,

$$|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \le N_\epsilon(\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta), \rho_{\mathcal{Q}}) \exp(\kappa d)$$

for every $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, finite $\mathcal{P} \ge \mathcal{Q}, F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!], \delta > 0$. This implies the lemma. □

The next lemma is a key part of the proof of Theorem 7.5: it enables us to define a map from $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, VW, \delta)$ to $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, V, \bar{\delta})$ for appropriate $\mathcal{P}, V, W, \delta, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, V, \bar{\delta}$.

Lemma 7.9. *Let $\mathcal{S}, \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ be any two π-generating sub-algebras of $\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$, $\kappa > 0$ and $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{S}$ be a finite partition. Then there exists $\epsilon, \delta, \bar{\delta} > 0$; finite partitions $\mathcal{P}, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}$; finite subsets $U, V, W \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and a homomorphism $\theta : \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V) \to \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^{VW})$ satisfying:*

1. *$\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{S}$;*
2. *$\bar{\mathcal{Q}} \le \bar{\mathcal{P}} \subset \bar{\mathcal{S}}$;*
3. *$U \cup \{\mathscr{H}^0\} \subset V$ and $\mathscr{H}^0 \in W$;*
4. *for each $u \in U$, $\mathfrak{r}(u) \in U$ and $\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(u) \in U$;*
5. *for each $v \in V$, $\mathfrak{r}(v) \in V$ and $\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(v) \in V$;*
6. *for each $w \in W$, $\mathfrak{r}(w) \in W$ and $\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(w) \in W$;*
7. *$\bar{\delta} < \epsilon/(8|\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U||U|)$;*
8. *$\delta < \bar{\delta}/(9|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V||\mathcal{P}^W||W|)$;*
9. *$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}) \le h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}) + \kappa$ for every finite partition $\mathcal{R}$ which refines $\mathcal{Q}$;*
10. *$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, V, \bar{\delta}) \le h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\mathcal{S}}) + \kappa$;*
11. *for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ there is a $\bar{Q} \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U)$ such that $\mu(Q \vartriangle \bar{Q}) < \epsilon/16$;*
12. *for every $\bar{P} \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V)$ there is a $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^W)$ such that $\mu(P \vartriangle \bar{P}) < \bar{\delta}/(12|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|)$;*
13. *$\mu(\theta(\bar{P}) \vartriangle \bar{P}) < \min(\bar{\delta}/(12|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|), \epsilon/(16|\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^V|))$ for all $\bar{P} \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V)$;*
14. *for every $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ and every $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, VW, \delta)$, $|\phi(P)|d^{-1} < 2\mu(P)$ for all $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^{VW})$ with $\mu(P) > 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.8 there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}) \le h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}) + \kappa$ for every finite partition $\mathcal{R}$ which refines $\mathcal{Q}$.

Because $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ is π-generating there are a finite partition $\bar{\mathcal{Q}} \subset \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ and a nonempty finite set $U \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ such that for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ there is a $\bar{Q} \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U)$ such that $\mu(Q \vartriangle \bar{Q}) < \epsilon/16$. By choosing U larger if necessary we may assume (4) is satisfied.

Take a finite partition $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \leq \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ with $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \geq \bar{\mathcal{Q}}$, a finite set $V \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ containing $U \cup \{\mathscr{H}^0\}$ and a $\bar{\delta} > 0$ such that

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\mathcal{S}}) + \kappa \geq h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, V, \bar{\delta}).$$

By shrinking $\bar{\delta}$ if necessary we may assume it is less than $\epsilon/(8|\bar{\mathcal{Q}}|^{|U|}|U|)$. By choosing V larger if necessary, we may assume (5) is satisfied.

Since $\mathcal{S}$ is π-generating, there are a finite partition $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{S}$ refining $\mathcal{Q}$ and a nonempty finite set $W \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ such that for every $\bar{P} \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V)$ there is a $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^W)$ such that $\mu(P \vartriangle \bar{P}) < \bar{\delta}/(12|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|)$. By choosing $\mathcal{P}$ finer and W larger if necessary, we may assume that $\mathscr{H}^0 \in W$, (6) is satisfied and by Lemma 7.6, that there is a homomorphism $\theta : \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V) \to \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^{VW})$ such that $\mu(\theta(\bar{P}) \vartriangle \bar{P})$ is less than both $\bar{\delta}/(12|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|)$ and $\epsilon/(16|\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^V|)$ for all $\bar{P} \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V)$.

Take a $\delta > 0$ which is smaller than $\bar{\delta}/(9|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V||\mathcal{P}^W||W|)$ and also small enough so that for every $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ and every $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, VW, \delta)$, $|\phi(P)|d^{-1} < 2\mu(P)$ for all $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^{VW})$. □

To motivate the next lemma, observe that if $F \subset_f [\mathscr{H}]$ and $\mathcal{P}$ is a finite partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$ then every atom of $\mathcal{P}^F$ has the form $\bigcap_{f \in F} f \cdot Y_f$ for some choice of $Y_f \in \mathcal{P}$. This simple fact no longer holds if $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ instead. The next lemma obtains a slightly weaker conclusion under an additional hypothesis.

Lemma 7.10. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a finite partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$ and $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$. Suppose that for every $f \in F$, $\mathfrak{r}(f) \in F$ and $\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(f) \in F$. Then for every $Y \in \mathcal{P}^F$ there exists a subset $F_Y \subset F$ and for every $f \in F_Y$ a set $Y_f \in \mathcal{P} \cup \{\mathscr{G}^0\}$ such that*

$$Y = \bigcap_{f \in F_Y} f \cdot Y_f.$$

Moreover, we may choose Y_f so that if $Y_f = \mathscr{G}^0$ then $f = \mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(g)$ for some $g \in F$.

Proof. Let $F_Y \subset F$ be the set of all $f \in F$ such that there exists a set $Y_f \in \mathcal{P} \cup \{\mathscr{G}^0\}$ such that $Y \subset f \cdot Y_f$. We choose Y_f so that it is the smallest set in $\mathcal{P} \cup \{\mathscr{G}^0\}$ with $Y \subset f \cdot Y_f$. It is obvious that $Y \subset \bigcap_{f \in F_Y} f \cdot Y_f$.

Given a subset $Z \subset \mathscr{G}^0$, let $Z^+ = Z$ and $Z^- = \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus Z$. By definition of $\mathcal{P}^F$, there exists a map $\gamma : F \times \mathcal{P} \to \{-, +\}$ such that

$$Y = \bigcap_{f \in F} \bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (f \cdot P)^{\gamma(f,P)}.$$

So it suffices to show that if $f \in F$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}$ are such that $Y \subset \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus (f \cdot P)$ then there is a $g \in F_Y$ such that $g \cdot Y_g \subset \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus f \cdot P$.

Because F contains $\{\mathfrak{r}(f), \mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(f) : f \in F\}$, it follows that $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{r}(f)) \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F)$ for all $f \in F$. Therefore, either $Y \subset \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{r}(f))$ or $Y \cap \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{r}(f)) = \emptyset$. In the first case, $Y \subset f \cdot (\mathscr{G}^0 \setminus P)$ so there is a set $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ with $Q \neq P$ such that

$$Y \subset f \cdot Q \subset f \cdot (\mathscr{G}^0 \setminus P) \subset \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus f \cdot P.$$

So set $g = f, Y_g = Q$. In the second case, $Y \subset \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{r}(f)) \subset \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus f \cdot P$. So set $g = \mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(f)$ and $Y_g = \mathscr{G}^0$. □

Proof of Theorem 7.5. By symmetry it suffices to show that if $\mathcal{S}, \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ are any two π-generating sub-algebras of $\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{G}^0)$ then $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{S}) \le h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \bar{\mathcal{S}})$. Let $\kappa > 0$, $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{S}$ be a finite partition and let $\epsilon, \delta, \bar{\delta}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}, U, V, W, \theta$ be as in Lemma 7.9. It suffices to show that $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}) \le h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \bar{\mathcal{S}}) + 2\kappa$.

Let $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, VW, \delta)$. Set $\phi^\sharp = \phi \circ \theta$. The purpose of the next three claims is to show that $\phi^\sharp \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, V, \bar{\delta})$ when σ is sufficiently multiplicative.

Claim 1. If $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ is (VW, δ)-multiplicative then for every $v \in V$ and $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^W)$,

$$d^{-1}|\phi(v \cdot P) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi(P)| < \frac{\bar{\delta}}{3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|}.$$

Proof of Claim 1. Because $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^W)$, there exists a collection $\Lambda_P \subset \mathcal{P}^W$ such that $P = \bigcup_{Y \in \Lambda_P} Y$. By Lemma 7.10, for each such Y, there is a set $W_Y \subset W$ and for each $w \in W_Y$ a set $Y_w \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P})$ such that $Y = \bigcap_{w \in W_Y} w \cdot Y_w$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
& d^{-1}|\phi(v \cdot P) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi(P)| \\
\le\ & d^{-1} \sum_{Y \in \Lambda_P} \sum_{w \in W_Y} |\phi(vw \cdot Y_w) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi(w \cdot Y_w)| \\
\le\ & d^{-1} \sum_{Y \in \Lambda_P} \sum_{w \in W_Y} |\phi(vw \cdot Y_w) \vartriangle \sigma_{vw} \cdot \phi(Y_w)| + |\sigma_{vw} \cdot \phi(Y_w) \vartriangle \sigma_v \sigma_w \cdot \phi(Y_w)| \\
& \quad + |\sigma_v(\sigma_w \cdot \phi(Y_w) \vartriangle \phi(w \cdot Y_w))|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \quad 3|\mathcal{P}^W||W|\delta < \frac{\bar\delta}{3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|}.$$

To see this, note that since $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, VW, \delta)$, $d^{-1}|\phi(vw \cdot Y_w) \vartriangle \sigma_{vw} \cdot \phi(Y_w)| < \delta$ (for all $w \in W, Y_w \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P})$). Similarly, $d^{-1}|\sigma_w \cdot \phi(Y_w) \vartriangle \phi(w \cdot Y_w)| < \delta$. Because σ is (VW, δ)-multiplicative, $d^{-1}|\sigma_{vw} \cdot \phi(Y_w) \vartriangle \sigma_v\sigma_w \cdot \phi(Y_w)| < \delta$ as well. □

As in Lemma 7.9 for $\bar P \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V)$, let $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^W)$ be such that $\mu(P \vartriangle \bar P) < \bar\delta/(12|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|)$.

Claim 2. If $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ is (VW, δ)-multiplicative then for every $v \in V$,

$$\frac{1}{d}\sum_{\bar P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} |\phi^\sharp(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi^\sharp(\bar P)| < \bar\delta.$$

Proof of Claim 2. Note:

$$\frac{1}{d}\sum_{\bar P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} |\phi^\sharp(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi^\sharp(\bar P)| \quad \leq \quad \frac{1}{d}\sum_{\bar P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} |\phi(\theta(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle v \cdot P)| + |\phi(v \cdot P) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi(P)| + |\sigma_v \cdot \phi(P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P))|.$$

By item (14) of Lemma 7.9, $d^{-1}|\phi(\theta(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle v \cdot P)| < 2\mu(\theta(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle v \cdot P)$. By items (12) and (13),

$$\mu(\theta(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle v \cdot P) \leq \mu(\theta(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle v \cdot \bar P) + \mu(P \vartriangle \bar P) < \bar\delta/6|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|.$$

So

$$d^{-1}|\phi(\theta(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle v \cdot P)| < \bar\delta/3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|.$$

Claim 1 implies $d^{-1}|\phi(v \cdot P) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi(P)| < \frac{\bar\delta}{3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|}$. By item (14) again, $d^{-1}|\sigma_v \cdot \phi(P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P))| \leq d^{-1}|\phi(P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P))| < 2\mu(P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P))$. Also $\mu(P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P)) \leq \mu(P \vartriangle \bar P) + \mu(\bar P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P)) < \bar\delta/6|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^U|$ by items (12) and (13) of Lemma 7.9. Thus

$$d^{-1}|\sigma_v \cdot \phi(P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P))| \leq d^{-1}|\phi(P \vartriangle \theta(\bar P))| < \bar\delta/3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|.$$

Putting all of these estimates together yields

$$\frac{1}{d}\sum_{\bar P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} |\phi^\sharp(v \cdot \bar P) \vartriangle \sigma_v \cdot \phi^\sharp(\bar P)| \quad < \quad \sum_{\bar P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{\bar\delta}{3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|} + \frac{\bar\delta}{3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|} + \frac{\bar\delta}{3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}|} \leq \bar\delta.$$

□

Claim 3. If σ is (VW, δ)-multiplicative then $\phi^\sharp \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \bar{\mathcal{P}}, V, \bar\delta)$.

Proof of Claim 3. Let $\bar{P} \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^V$. By (12,13,14) of Lemma 7.9,

$$d^{-1}|\phi(\theta(\bar{P}) \vartriangle P)| < 2\mu(\theta(\bar{P}) \vartriangle P) \le 2\mu(\theta(\bar{P}) \vartriangle \bar{P}) + 2\mu(\bar{P} \vartriangle P) < \bar{\delta}/(3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|).$$

Because $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, VW, \delta)$, for every $\bar{P} \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^V$, we have $|d^{-1}|\phi(P)| - \mu(P)| < \delta < \bar{\delta}/(3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|)$. By (12) of Lemma 7.9 again, we have $\mu(P \vartriangle \bar{P}) < \bar{\delta}/(6|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|)$. So

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\bar{P}\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V} |d^{-1}|\phi^\sharp(\bar{P})| - \mu(\bar{P})| &\le \sum_{\bar{P}\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V} d^{-1}|\phi(\theta(\bar{P}) \vartriangle P)| + |d^{-1}|\phi(P)| - \mu(P)| + \mu(P \vartriangle \bar{P}) \\ &< \sum_{\bar{P}\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V} \bar{\delta}/(3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|) + \bar{\delta}/(3|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|) + \bar{\delta}/(6|\bar{\mathcal{P}}^V|) \le \bar{\delta}.\end{aligned}$$

Together with Claim 2, this implies Claim 3. □

Claim 4. Let $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ be such that $\bar{\epsilon} < \epsilon/(8|\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U||U|)$. Let $\phi, \psi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, VW, \delta)$ be two elements with $\rho_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}}(\phi^\sharp, \psi^\sharp) < 2\bar{\epsilon}$. If σ is (VW, δ)-multiplicative then $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi, \psi) < \epsilon$.

Proof of Claim 4. Let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Recall from Lemma 7.9 that there is a $\bar{Q} \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U)$ such that $\mu(Q \vartriangle \bar{Q}) < \epsilon/16$. By Lemma 7.10 for $Y \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U$ there exists $U_Y \subset U$ and for each $u \in U_Y$ a set $Y_u \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}} \cup \{\mathscr{G}^0\}$ such that $Y = \bigcap_{u\in U_Y} u \cdot Y_u$. So $\bar{Q} = \bigcup_{Y\in\Lambda_Q} \bigcap_{u\in U_Y} u \cdot Y_u$ for some collection $\Lambda_Q \subset \bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U$.

Because $\bar{\mathcal{Q}} < \bar{\mathcal{P}}$ and $U \subset V$, Claim 2 implies

$$d^{-1}|\phi^\sharp(u \cdot Y_u) \vartriangle \sigma_u \cdot \phi^\sharp(Y_u)| < \bar{\delta}, \quad d^{-1}|\sigma_u \cdot \psi^\sharp(Y_u) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(u \cdot Y_u)| < \bar{\delta} \quad \forall u \in U.$$

Because $\rho_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}}(\phi^\sharp, \psi^\sharp) < 2\bar{\epsilon}$, we also have

$$d^{-1}|\sigma_u \cdot (\phi^\sharp(Y_u) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(Y_u))| \le d^{-1}|\phi^\sharp(Y_u) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(Y_u)| < 2\bar{\epsilon}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&d^{-1}|\phi^\sharp(\bar{Q}) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(\bar{Q})| \\ \le\ & d^{-1} \sum_{Y\in\Lambda_Q} \sum_{u\in U_Y} |\phi^\sharp(u \cdot Y_u) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(u \cdot Y_u)| \\ \le\ & d^{-1} \sum_{Y\in\Lambda_Q} \sum_{u\in U_Y} |\phi^\sharp(u \cdot Y_u) \vartriangle \sigma_u \cdot \phi^\sharp(Y_u)| + |\sigma_u \cdot (\phi^\sharp(Y_u) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(Y_u))| + |\sigma_u \cdot \psi^\sharp(Y_u) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(u \cdot Y_u)| \\ <\ & \sum_{Y\in\Lambda_Q} \sum_{u\in U} 2\bar{\delta} + 2\bar{\epsilon} \le 2(\bar{\delta} + \bar{\epsilon})|\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U||U| \le \epsilon/2.\end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\mu(Q \vartriangle \theta(\bar{Q})) \le \mu(Q \vartriangle \bar{Q}) + \mu(\bar{Q} \vartriangle \theta(\bar{Q})) < \epsilon/16 + \epsilon/(16|\bar{\mathcal{Q}}^U|) \le \epsilon/8.$$

The second to last inequality above follows from items (2,3,13) of Lemma 7.9. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi,\psi) &= \max_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} \frac{1}{d}|\phi(Q) \vartriangle \psi(Q)| \\ &\le \max_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} \frac{1}{d}|\phi(Q \vartriangle \theta(\bar{Q}))| + \frac{1}{d}|\phi^\sharp(\bar{Q}) \vartriangle \psi^\sharp(\bar{Q})| + \frac{1}{d}|\psi(\theta(\bar{Q}) \vartriangle Q)| \\ &\le \epsilon/2 + 4\max_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} \mu(Q \vartriangle \theta(\bar{Q})) < \epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality above uses item (14) of Lemma 7.9. This proves the claim. □

Let $\Gamma : \mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},VW,\delta) \to \mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\bar{\mathcal{P}},V,\bar{\delta})$ be the map $\Gamma(\phi) = \phi^\sharp$. If σ is (VW,δ)-multiplicative then by Claim 3, Γ really does map into $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\bar{\mathcal{P}},V,\bar{\delta})$ as required. It follows from Claim 4 that for every $(\rho_{\mathcal{Q}},\epsilon)$-separated subset $Z \subset \mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},VW,\delta)$, the image $\Gamma(Z)$ is $(\rho_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}},2\bar{\epsilon})$-separated. So,

$$N_\epsilon(\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},VW,\delta),\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}) \le N_{2\bar{\epsilon}}(\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\bar{\mathcal{P}},V,\bar{\delta}),\rho_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}}) \le |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\bar{\mathcal{P}},V,\bar{\delta})|_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}}.$$

By items (9,10) of Lemma 7.9,

$$\begin{aligned}h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{S}) &\le h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P}) \overset{(9)}{\le} h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P}) + \kappa \\ &\le \lim_{j\to\beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log\left(\|N_\epsilon(\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\cdot,\mathcal{P},VW,\delta),\rho_{\mathcal{Q}})\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}\right) + \kappa \\ &\le \lim_{j\to\beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log\left(\||\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\cdot,\bar{\mathcal{P}},V,\bar{\delta})|_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}}\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}\right) + \kappa = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\bar{\mathcal{Q}},\bar{\mathcal{P}},V,\bar{\delta}) + \kappa \\ &\overset{(10)}{\le} h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\bar{\mathcal{Q}},\bar{\mathcal{S}}) + 2\kappa \le h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\bar{\mathcal{S}}) + 2\kappa.\end{aligned}$$

Because $\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{S}$ is an arbitrary finite partition and $\kappa > 0$ is also arbitrary, we conclude that $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{S}) \le h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\bar{\mathcal{S}})$ as required. □

8. REPLACING $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ WITH $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$

The purpose of this section is to show that $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ can be replaced with $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ in the definition of measure entropy under mild conditions, explained next.

Definition 8.1. Let $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be a discrete pmp groupoid, $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $\delta > 0$. We say σ is (F,δ)-*continuous* if $|\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d < \delta + \nu(f \vartriangle g)\ \forall f,g \in F$. If $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_j\}_{j\in J}$ is a sofic approximation to $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$, then we say $\mathbb{P}$ is *asymptotically continuous* if for every $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!], \delta > 0$, there exists $j \in J$ such that $j' \ge j$ implies $\mathbb{P}_{j'}$-almost every σ is (F,δ)-continuous.

To justify our claim that the condition above is mild, first note that if $\mathscr{H}$ is a group (as in example 2.1) then every map $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ is (F,δ)-continuous and therefore every sofic approximation is asymptotically continuous. This is because if $f \neq g$ then $\nu(f \vartriangle g) = 2 \geq |\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|$. For further justification, the next lemma implies that if σ is sufficiently multiplicative and trace-preserving then it is (F,δ)-continuous. We will not need it in the rest of the paper.

Lemma 8.2. *Let* $f,g \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, $F = \{f, g, f^{-1}g, f^{-1}, \mathfrak{s}(f), \mathfrak{r}(f), \mathfrak{s}(g), \mathfrak{r}(g)\}$ *and* $\delta > 0$. *If* $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ *is* (F,δ)*-multiplicative and* (F,δ)*-trace-preserving then* σ *is* $(\{f,g\}, 58\delta)$*-continuous.*

Remark 8.1. This lemma implies that if each $\mathbb{P}_j$ is concentrated on a single map σ_j then $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_j\}_{j\in J}$ is asymptotically continuous. Therefore, any sofic groupoid admits an asymptotically continuous sofic approximation.

Proof. Recall that $\mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{f^{-1}g}) = |\sigma_{f^{-1}g} \cap \Delta^0_d|_d$. Because σ is (F,δ)-multiplicative, $|\sigma_{f^{-1}g} \vartriangle \sigma_{f^{-1}}\sigma_g| \leq \delta$. By Lemma 3.3, $|\sigma_{f^{-1}} \vartriangle \sigma_f^{-1}| \leq 15\delta$. So

$$|\mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{f^{-1}g}) - |\sigma_f^{-1}\sigma_g \cap \Delta^0_d|_d \leq 16\delta.$$

Observe that $\mathfrak{s}(\sigma_f \cap \sigma_g) = \sigma_f^{-1}\sigma_g \cap \Delta^0_d$. By Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{f^{-1}g}) &\leq 16\delta + |\mathfrak{s}(\sigma_f \cap \sigma_g)|_d = 16\delta + |\sigma_f \cap \sigma_g|_d = 16\delta + \frac{1}{2}\left(|\sigma_f|_d + |\sigma_g|_d - |\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d\right) \\
&= 16\delta + \frac{1}{2}\left(|\mathfrak{s}(\sigma_f)|_d + |\mathfrak{s}(\sigma_g)|_d - |\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d\right) \leq 26\delta + \frac{1}{2}\left(|\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(f)}|_d + |\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(g)}|_d - |\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d\right) \\
&\leq 27\delta + \frac{1}{2}\left(|\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(f)} \cap \Delta^0_d|_d + |\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(g)} \cap \Delta^0_d|_d - |\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d\right) \\
&= 27\delta + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(f)}) + \mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(g)}) - |\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms we obtain:

$$|\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d \leq 54\delta + \mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(f)}) + \mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}(g)}) - 2\mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma_{f^{-1}g}).$$

Because σ is (F,δ)-trace preserving

$$\begin{aligned}
|\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_g|_d &\leq 58\delta + \nu(\mathfrak{s}(f)) + \nu(\mathfrak{s}(g)) - 2\mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}^0}(f^{-1}g) = 58\delta + \nu(f) + \nu(g) - 2\nu(f^{-1}g \cap \mathscr{H}^0) \\
&= 58\delta + \nu(f) + \nu(g) - 2\nu(f \cap g) = 58\delta + \nu(f \vartriangle g).
\end{aligned}$$

So σ is $(\{f,g\}, 58\delta)$-continuous as required. □

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 8.3. *Let* $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ *be a discrete pmp étale topological groupoid. Assume* ν *is regular,* $\mathscr{H}^0$ *is compact and metrizable and* $\mathbb{P}$ *is asymptotically continuous. Then for every pmp class-bijective extension* $\pi : (\mathscr{G}^0,\mu) \to (\mathscr{H}^0,\nu)$ *and finite Borel partitions* $\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{P}$ *of* $\mathscr{G}^0$*, we have*

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P}) = \inf_{F\subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}} \inf_{\delta>0} \lim_{j\to\beta} d_j^{-1} \log \| |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\cdot,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.$$

In other words, we can replace $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ *in the definition of* $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P})$ *with* $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$*.*

This theorem is crucial to our proof that the measure entropy defined in §7 agrees with the measure entropy defined in §9; which itself is key to establishing the variational principle. Theorem 8.3 is a consequence of the next three lemmas.

Notation 8.2. Let X be a metrizable space and λ a regular Borel measure on X. For any subset $Y \subset X$, let $\partial Y = Y \cap \overline{X \setminus Y}$. We let $\mathcal{B}_\partial(X,\lambda)$ denote the collection of all Borel subsets $Y \subset X$ with $\lambda(\partial Y) = \lambda(\partial(X \setminus Y)) = 0$.

Lemma 8.4. *Given any metrizable space* X *with a regular Borel measure* λ*,* $\mathcal{B}_\partial(X,\lambda)$ *is an algebra. Also for any measurable* $C \subset X$ *with* $\lambda(C) < \infty$ *and* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists* $A \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(X,\lambda)$ *with* $\lambda(A \vartriangle C) < \epsilon$*. Moreover if* C *is open then we can choose* $A \subset C$*.*

Proof. To simply notation, let $Y^c = X \setminus Y$ for any $Y \subset X$.

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(X,\lambda)$. Observe that $\partial(A\cup B) \subset \partial A \cup \partial B$. Hence $\lambda(\partial(A\cup B)) = 0$. Also, $\partial(A\cap B) \subset \partial A \cup \partial B$ which implies $\lambda(\partial(A\cap B)) = 0$. To see this, let $x \in \partial(A\cap B)$. Then there exist elements $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset (A\cap B)^c$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = x$. Because $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset A^c \cup B^c$, either $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \cap A^c$ is infinite or $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \cap B^c$ is infinite. In the first case, $x \in \partial A$ and in the second $x \in \partial B$ which proves the claim.

Because $(A\cup B)^c = (A^c \cap B^c)$ and $(A\cap B)^c = A^c \cup B^c$, it now follows that $A \cup B \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(X,\lambda)$ and $A\cap B \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(X,\lambda)$. So $\mathcal{B}_\partial(X,\lambda)$ is an algebra.

Let ρ be a continuous metric on X. For any subset $L \subset X$ and $r > 0$, let $N_r(L) = \{x \in X :\ \exists y \in L\ \rho(x,y) \le r\}$. Let $C \subset X$ be a measurable set with finite measure and $\epsilon > 0$. Because λ is regular, there exists a compact set $K \subset C$ with $\lambda(C \setminus K) < \epsilon/2$. Because K is closed, $K = \cap_{r>0} N_r(K)$. So there exists an $r > 0$ such that $\lambda(N_r(K) \setminus K) < \epsilon/2$. If C is open, we can choose $r > 0$ so that $N_r(K) \subset C$.

Suppose $0 < s < t$. We claim that $\partial N_s(K) \cap \partial N_t(K) = \emptyset$. Indeed, if $x \in \partial N_s(K) \cap \partial N_t(K)$ then there exists a sequence $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset N_t(K)^c$ with $\lim_{i\to\infty} y_i = x$. Since $\rho(y_i, K) > t$ for every i, $\liminf_{i\to\infty} \rho(y_i, K) \geq t$ which implies $\rho(x, K) \geq t$. Since $x \in N_t(K)$, we must have $\rho(x, K) = t$. However, $x \in N_s(K)$ as well, so $\rho(x, K) \leq s < t$. This contradiction proves the claim.

Because any uncountable sum of positive numbers equals positive infinity, for any $x \in X$ there is at most a countable number of numbers $t > 0$ such that $\lambda(\partial N_t(x)) > 0$. By compactness there exist a finite set $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in K$ and numbers $r_1, \ldots, r_n > 0$ such that

- $r_i < r$ for all i;
- $\lambda(\partial N_{r_i}(x_i)) = 0$ for all i;
- $K \subset \cup_{i=1}^n N_{r_i}(x_i)$.

Let $A = \cup_{i=1}^n N_{r_i}(x_i)$. The complement of any $N_{r_i}(x_i)$ is an open set and therefore has empty boundary. So $N_{r_i}(x_i) \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(X, \lambda)$ for each i. Because $\mathcal{B}_\partial(X, \lambda)$ is an algebra, $A \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(X, \lambda)$. By construction, $K \subset A \subset N_r(K)$ which implies

$$A \vartriangle C \subset (C \setminus K) \cup (N_r(K) \setminus K) \Rightarrow \lambda(A \vartriangle C) < \epsilon$$

as required. Moreover if C is open then $A \subset N_r(K) \subset C$. □

Lemma 8.5. *If $\mathscr{H}$ is étale, $\mathscr{H}^0$ is compact and metrizable and ν is regular then $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ is dense in $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ in the measure-algebra sense. This means that for every $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $f' \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ such that $\nu(f \vartriangle f') < \epsilon$.*

Proof. Because ν is regular, there exists a compact set $K \subset f$ and an open set $O \supset f$ such that $\nu(O \setminus K) < \epsilon$. Because K is compact and $\mathscr{H}$ is étale, there exists a finite collection $U_1, \ldots, U_n$ of bisections with $K \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U_i \subset O$.

By Lemma 8.4 there exist sets $T_i, V_i \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ such that $T_i \subset \mathfrak{r}(U_i), V_i \subset \mathfrak{s}(U_i)$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \nu(T_i \vartriangle \mathfrak{r}(U_i)) + \nu(V_i \vartriangle \mathfrak{s}(U_i)) < \epsilon.$$

So

$$\nu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n T_i U_i V_i \vartriangle \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \nu(T_i U_i V_i \vartriangle U_i) \leq \epsilon.$$

We define U_i' by $U_1' = T_1U_1V_1$ and

$$U_i' = T_iU_iV_i \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j<i} T_jU_jV_j\right)$$

for $i > 1$.

For $x \in \mathscr{H}^0$, let $m(x)$ be the number of indices i such that $x \in \mathfrak{s}(U_i')$. Let $Y_s = \{x \in \mathscr{H}^0 :\ m(x) \ge 2\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(K) + 2\epsilon &\ge \nu(O) + \epsilon \ge \nu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i\right) + \epsilon \ge \nu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n T_iU_iV_i\right) = \nu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i'\right)\\
&= \int_{\mathscr{H}^0} m(x)\ d\nu(x) \ge \nu\left(\mathfrak{s}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i'\right)\right) + \nu(Y_s) \ge \nu\left(\mathfrak{s}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i\right)\right) + \nu(Y_s) - \epsilon\\
&\ge \nu(\mathfrak{s}(K)) + \nu(Y_s) - \epsilon = \nu(K) + \nu(Y_s) - \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $3\epsilon \ge \nu(Y_s)$. Similarly, if Y_r is the set of all $x \in \mathscr{H}^0$ such that there exist $i \ne j$ such that $x \in \mathfrak{r}(U_i') \cap \mathfrak{r}(U_j')$ then $\nu(Y_r) \le 3\epsilon$.

Finally, let

$$U_i'' = (\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus Y_r)U_i'(\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus Y_s)$$

and $f' = \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i''$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(f' \vartriangle f) &\le \nu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i'' \vartriangle \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i'\right) + \nu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i' \vartriangle \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i\right) + \nu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i \vartriangle f\right)\\
&\le \nu(Y_s) + \nu(Y_r) + \epsilon + \epsilon \le 8\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Because $V_i \subset \mathfrak{s}(U_i)$, $T_i \subset \mathfrak{r}(U_i)$, it follows that $\mathfrak{s}(T_iU_iV_i) = V_i$, $\mathfrak{r}(T_iU_iV_i) = T_i$. Because $V_i, T_i \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ which is an algebra, it follows that $\mathfrak{s}(U_i'), \mathfrak{r}(U_i') \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ for each i. Therefore, $Y_s, Y_r \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ for each i which implies $\mathfrak{s}(U_i''), \mathfrak{r}(U_i'') \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$. Because $U_i'' \subset U_i$, U_i is a bisection and the U_i'' have pairwise disjoint sources and ranges, it follows that $f' = \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i'' \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ as required.

□

Lemma 8.6. *Let $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ be a discrete pmp groupoid. Suppose $\mathbb{P}$ is asymptotically continuous and $\mathcal{F} \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ is dense in the sense that for every $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $f' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\nu(f \vartriangle f') < \epsilon$. We also require $\mathscr{H}_0 \in \mathcal{F}$. Then for every pmp* *class-bijective extension* $\pi : (\mathscr{G}, \mu) \to (\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ *and finite Borel partitions* $\mathcal{Q} \leq \mathcal{P}$ *of* $\mathscr{G}^0$*, we have*

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \inf_{F \subset_f \mathcal{F}} \inf_{\delta > 0} \lim_{j \to \beta} d_j^{-1} \log \| |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \|_{p, \mathbb{P}_j}.$$

In other words, we can replace $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ *in the definition of* $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ *with* $\mathcal{F}$*.*

Proof. It is immediate that

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \leq \inf_{F \subset_f \mathcal{F}} \inf_{\delta > 0} \lim_{j \to \beta} d_j^{-1} \log \| |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \|_{p, \mathbb{P}_j}$$

so we need only prove the opposite inequality.

Let $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ be such that $\mathscr{H}^0 \in F$ and for every $f \in F$, $\mathfrak{r}(f), \mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{r}(f) \in F$. Let $\delta > 0$ and choose δ' so that $0 < \delta' < \delta/(10|F||\mathcal{P}^F|^2)$. By hypothesis there exist $F' \subset_f \mathcal{F}$ and a bijection $\theta : F \to F'$ such that $\nu(f \vartriangle \theta(f)) < \delta'$ for all $f \in F$. We require that $\mathscr{H}^0 \in F'$ and $\theta(\mathscr{H}^0) = \mathscr{H}^0$. We will show that if σ is $(F \cup F', \delta')$-continuous then $|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')|_{\mathcal{Q}} \leq |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

Define $\Psi : \mathcal{P}^F \to \mathcal{P}^{F'}$ as follows. By Lemma 7.10, for every $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F)$, there exists a finite set $\Lambda_P \subset F$ and for each $f \in \Lambda_P$ a set $Y_f \in \mathcal{P} \cup \{\mathscr{G}^0\}$ such that $P = \cap_{f \in \Lambda_P} f \cdot Y_f$. Moreover, by choosing Λ_P to be as large as possible and each Y_f to be as small as possible, this representation is uniquely determined by P. We define

$$\Psi(P) = \Psi\left(\bigcap_{f \in \Lambda_P} f \cdot Y_f\right) := \bigcap_{f \in \Lambda_P} \theta(f) \cdot Y_f.$$

Because $\nu(f \vartriangle \theta(f)) < \delta'$, it follows that $\mu(\Psi(P) \vartriangle P) < \delta'|F|$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}^F$.

We extend Ψ to a map from $\Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F) \to \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^{F'})$ by requiring $\Psi(P \cup Q) = \Psi(P) \cup \Psi(Q)$ for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}^F$. We claim that for any $Y \in \mathcal{P}$, $\Psi(Y) \subset Y$. To see this, suppose $P \in \mathcal{P}^F, P \subset Y$. As above, we represent P by $P = \cap_{f \in \Lambda_P} f Y_f$. We must have $Y_{\mathscr{H}^0} = Y$. Thus $\Psi(P) = \cap_{f \in \Lambda_P} \theta(f) Y_f$ implies, because $\theta(\mathscr{H}^0) = \mathscr{H}^0$, that $\Psi(P) \subset Y$. Because P is arbitrary, $\Psi(Y) \subset Y$ as claimed.

The map Ψ might not be a homomorphism from $\Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F)$ to $\Sigma(\mathcal{P}^{F'})$. To correct for this possibility, for any $Y \in \mathcal{P}$, we enumerate the atoms of $\mathcal{P}^F$ contained in Y by $\{P_1^Y, \ldots, P_{n(Y)}^Y\}$. Then define $\Psi' : \mathcal{P}^F \to \mathcal{P}^{F'}$ by $\Psi'(P_1^Y) = \Psi(P_1^Y)$,

$$\Psi'(P_i^Y) = \Psi(P_i^Y) \setminus \cup_{j < i} \Psi(P_j^Y)$$

for $1 < i < n(Y)$ and $\Psi'(P^Y_{n(Y)}) = Y \setminus \cup_{j<n(Y)} \Psi'(P^Y_j)$. Because $\Psi(Y) \subset Y$, Ψ' extends to a unique homomorphism from $\Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F)$ to $\Sigma(\mathcal{P}^{F'})$ which we also denote by Ψ'. Moreover, Ψ' fixes $\mathcal{P}$ pointwise.

Next, we estimate how far Ψ' is from the identity map. Because $\mathcal{P}^F$ is a partition, for any $P \neq Q \in \mathcal{P}^F$

$$\Psi(P) \cap \Psi(Q) \subset (\Psi(P) \setminus P) \cup (\Psi(Q) \setminus Q).$$

Observe that $\Psi'(P) \vartriangle \Psi(P) \subset \cup_{Q_1 \neq Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}^F} \Psi(Q_1) \cap \Psi(Q_2)$. Therefore, if $R \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F)$ then

$$\Psi'(R) \vartriangle R \subset (\Psi'(R) \vartriangle \Psi(R)) \cup (\Psi(R) \vartriangle R) \subset \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}^F} \Psi(Q) \vartriangle Q$$

which implies

$$\mu(\Psi'(R) \vartriangle R) \le \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}^F} \mu(\Psi(Q) \vartriangle Q) < \delta' |F| |\mathcal{P}^F|. \tag{1}$$

Also note that if $f \in F, P \in \mathcal{P}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\theta(f) \cdot P \vartriangle \Psi'(f \cdot P)) &\le \mu(\theta(f) \cdot P \vartriangle f \cdot P) + \mu(f \cdot P \vartriangle \Psi'(f \cdot P)) & (2)\\ &< \delta' + \delta' |F| |\mathcal{P}^F| \le 2\delta' |F| |\mathcal{P}^F|. & (3) \end{aligned}$$

Next we show that the map $\phi \mapsto \phi \circ \Psi'$ takes $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')$ into $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)$. So let $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')$. By (1),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^F} \big| |\phi \Psi'(P)|_d - \mu(P) \big| &\le \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^F} \big| |\phi \Psi'(P)|_d - \mu(\Psi'(P)) \big| + |\mu(\Psi'(P)) - \mu(P)| \\ &< \delta' + \delta' |F| |\mathcal{P}^F|^2 < \delta. \end{aligned}$$

This uses that $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')$. Next we observe that for any $f \in F$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\sigma_f \cdot \phi \Psi'(P) \vartriangle \phi \Psi'(f \cdot P)|_d \\ \le &\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\sigma_f \cdot \phi \Psi'(P) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot \phi(P)|_d + |\sigma_f \cdot \phi(P) \vartriangle \sigma_{\theta(f)} \cdot \phi(P)|_d \\ &\quad + |\sigma_{\theta(f)} \cdot \phi(P) \vartriangle \phi(\theta(f) \cdot P)|_d + |\phi(\theta(f) \cdot P) \vartriangle \phi \Psi'(f \cdot P)|_d. \end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate each of the four terms above. The first term equals zero because $\Psi'(P) = P$ for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Because σ is $(F \cup F', \delta')$-continuous,

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\sigma_f \cdot \phi(P) \vartriangle \sigma_{\theta(f)} \cdot \phi(P)|_d \le |\sigma_f \vartriangle \sigma_{\theta(f)}| < \delta' + \nu(f \vartriangle \theta(f)) < 2\delta'.$$

Because $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')$,

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\sigma_{\theta(f)} \cdot \phi(P) \vartriangle \phi(\theta(f) \cdot P)|_d < \delta'.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\phi(\theta(f) \cdot P) \vartriangle \phi\Psi'(f \cdot P)|_d = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\phi(\theta(f) \cdot P \vartriangle \Psi'(f \cdot P))|_d \\ \leq \quad & \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} ||\phi(\theta(f) \cdot P \vartriangle \Psi'(f \cdot P))|_d - \mu(\theta(f) \cdot P \vartriangle \Psi'(f \cdot P))| + \mu(\theta(f) \cdot P \vartriangle \Psi'(f \cdot P)) \\ < \quad & \delta'|\mathcal{P}| + 2\delta'|F||\mathcal{P}^F|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last line above uses that $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')$ (and therefore $\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{F'}} ||\phi(P)|_d - \mu(P)| \leq \delta'$) and (3).

Putting this altogether we obtain:

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\sigma_f \cdot \phi\Psi'(P) \vartriangle \phi\Psi'(f \cdot P)|_d \leq 2\delta' + \delta' + \delta'|\mathcal{P}| + 2\delta'|F||\mathcal{P}^F|^2 < 10\delta'|F||\mathcal{P}^F|^2 < \delta.$$

So $\phi\Psi' \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)$. Because Ψ' fixes $\mathcal{P}$ pointwise, it fixes $\mathcal{Q}$ pointwise. Therefore,

$$|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')|_{\mathcal{Q}} \leq |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}}.$$

Because $\mathbb{P}$ is asymptotically continuous, this implies

$$\lim_{j \to J} d_j^{-1} \log |||\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F', \delta')|_{\mathcal{Q}}||_{p, \mathbb{P}_j} \leq \lim_{j \to J} d_j^{-1} \log |||\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}}||_{p, \mathbb{P}_j}.$$

Now we take (in order) the infimum over $\delta' > 0$, the infimum over $F' \subset_f \mathcal{F}$, the infimum over $\delta > 0$, the infimum over $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ to obtain the lemma. □

The previous two lemmas imply Theorem 8.3.

9. Measure entropy via pseudo-metrics

The formulation of measure entropy in this section is closely aligned with topological entropy. We assume as given: two discrete pmp topological groupoids $\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}$ such that $\mathscr{G}^0$ and $\mathscr{H}^0$ are compact metrizable spaces, a class-bijective continuous factor $\pi : (\mathscr{G}, \mu) \to (\mathscr{H}, \nu)$, a sofic approximation $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_j\}_{j \in J}$ to $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$, a continuous pseudo-metric ρ on $\mathscr{G}^0$, a bias β and $p \in [1, \infty]$. From this data, we will define the *sofic measure entropy of* (π, ρ) *with respect to* $(\mathbb{P}, p, \beta)$ and show that when ρ is dynamically generating, $\mathscr{H}$ is étale, ν is regular and $\mathbb{P}$ is asymptotically continuous then this entropy coincides with the definition of §7.

Definition 9.1. Given a map $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, finite sets $F \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$, $K \subset C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ and $\delta > 0$, we let $Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$ be the set of all d-tuples $(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, \emptyset, \delta, \rho)$ (as defined in §6) such that

$$\max_{k \in K} \left| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} k(x_i) - \int_{\mathscr{G}^0} k \ d\mu \right| < \delta.$$

The main difference between $Orb_\nu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$ and $Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$ is that, in the first case $K \subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)$ while in the second case $K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)$. Define

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \rho, 2) := \sup_{\epsilon>0} \inf_{\delta>0} \inf_{F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}} \inf_{K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)} \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j};$$

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \rho, \infty) := \sup_{\epsilon>0} \inf_{\delta>0} \inf_{F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}} \inf_{K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)} \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.$$

We are suppressing the choice of bias β and parameter $p \in [1, \infty]$ from the notation.

Remark 9.1. As in the topological case, the order of the supremums, infimums and limits above is important with the exception that one can permute the three infimums without affecting the definition. There is a certain useful monotonicity phenomenon in the formulas above: the quantity

$$\frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}$$

is monotone increasing in δ and monotone decreasing in ϵ, F, K (subsets are ordered by inclusion). Therefore, the infimums and the supremum can be replaced by the appropriate (directed) limits. In the sequel, we will use these facts without explicit reference. Similar statements hold true if ρ_2 is replaced with ρ_∞ or N_ϵ is replaced with N'_ϵ.

Lemma 9.2. *If we replace $N_\epsilon(\cdot)$ in the definitions above with $N'_\epsilon(\cdot)$ then we obtain equivalent definitions. More precisely,*

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \rho, 2) := \sup_{\epsilon>0} \inf_{\delta>0} \inf_{F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}} \inf_{K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)} \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N'_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j};$$

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \rho, \infty) := \sup_{\epsilon>0} \inf_{\delta>0} \inf_{F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}} \inf_{K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)} \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N'_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.$$

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 5.2. □

Lemma 9.3. *In general,* $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho,2) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho,\infty)$.

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as the proof of Lemma 6.5. □

Notation 9.2. Because of the lemma above, we will write $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho)$ to denote either $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho,2)$ or $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho,\infty)$.

Lemma 9.4. *If* ρ_1, ρ_2 *are dynamically generating continuous pseudo-metrics on* $\mathscr{G}^0$ *then* $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho_1) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho_2)$.

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as the proof of Theorem 6.7. For example, note that

$$Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,\emptyset,\delta,\rho^\phi) \supset Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,\emptyset,\delta_0,\rho)$$

if and only if $Orb_\mu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho^\phi) \supset Orb_\mu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta_0,\rho)$ (for any finite $K \subset C(\mathscr{G}^0)$). □

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 9.5. *If* ρ *is a dynamically generating continuous pseudo-metric on* $\mathscr{G}^0$, $\mathscr{H}$ *is étale,* ν *is regular and* $\mathbb{P}$ *is asymptotically continuous then* $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi)$.

We will need the next lemma which shows that good homomorphisms have to be close to σ wherever this makes sense.

Lemma 9.6. *Let* $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ *be a discrete pmp groupoid,* $\pi : (\mathscr{G},\mu) \to (\mathscr{H},\nu)$ *a class-bijective pmp factor,* $\mathcal{P}$ *a finite Borel partition of* $\mathscr{G}^0$, $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ *and* $R \subset \mathscr{H}^0$ *a Borel set. Suppose* $R \in F$. *Let* $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ *be* (F,δ)*-multiplicative. If* $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)$ *then*

$$|\phi(\pi^{-1}(R)) \vartriangle \sigma(R)|_d < 3\delta.$$

Moreover, for any $f \in F$, *if* $fR \in F$ *then*

$$|\sigma_f \cdot \phi(\pi^{-1}(R)) \vartriangle \phi(f \cdot \pi^{-1}(R))|_d < 3\delta.$$

Proof. Because ϕ is a homomorphism, $\phi(\mathscr{G}^0) = \Delta_d^0$. By Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &> |\sigma_R \cdot \phi(\mathscr{G}^0) \vartriangle \phi(R \cdot \mathscr{G}^0)| \geq -\delta + |(\sigma_R \cap \Delta_d^0) \cdot \phi(\mathscr{G}^0) \vartriangle \phi(\pi^{-1}(R))| \\ &= -\delta + |(\sigma_R \cap \Delta_d^0) \vartriangle \phi(\pi^{-1}(R))| \geq -2\delta + |\sigma_R \vartriangle \phi(\pi^{-1}(R))| \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first inequality. Suppose $f, fR \in F$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &> |\sigma_{fR} \cdot \phi(\mathscr{G}^0) \vartriangle \phi(fR \cdot \mathscr{G}^0)|_d > |\sigma_f \sigma_R \cdot \phi(\mathscr{G}^0) \vartriangle \phi(f \cdot \pi^{-1}(R))|_d - \delta \\ &> |\sigma_f \cdot \phi(R \cdot \mathscr{G}^0) \vartriangle \phi(f \cdot \pi^{-1}(R))|_d - 2\delta = |\sigma_f \cdot \phi(\pi^{-1}(R)) \vartriangle \phi(f \cdot \pi^{-1}(R))|_d - 2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

The first and third inequalities follow from $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta)$ while the second inequality uses the (F, δ)-multiplicativity of σ. □

We will say that a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathscr{G}^0$ has *measure zero boundary* if $\mu(\partial P) = 0$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

Proof of Theorem 9.5. By Lemma 9.4, we may assume ρ is a metric on $\mathscr{G}^0$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite Borel partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$ with measure zero boundary such that each atom of $\mathcal{Q}$ has diameter $\leq \epsilon$ with respect to ρ. Let $\mathcal{P} \geq \mathcal{Q}$ be a finite Borel partition with measure zero boundary. To simplify notation, we will identify Δ_d^0 with $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ in the obvious way.

Claim 1. Given $\delta > 0$ and $F = F^{-1} \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ there exist $\delta' > 0$ and $K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ such that for any $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$,

$$|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, 2\delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \geq N_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta', \rho), \rho_\infty).$$

Proof of Claim 1. For $x \in \mathscr{G}^0$, let $\mathcal{P}(x)$ denote the atom of $\mathcal{P}$ containing x. For $\delta' > 0$, let

$$B(\mathcal{P}, \sqrt{\delta'}) := \{x \in \mathscr{G}^0 : \ \exists x' \in \mathscr{G}^0 \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{P}(x) \neq \mathcal{P}(x') \text{ and } \rho(x, x') < \sqrt{\delta'}\}.$$

Because $\mathcal{P}$ has measure zero boundary and $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ it follows that $\mathcal{P}^F$ has measure zero boundary. Because μ is regular on $\mathscr{G}^0$ there exists a $\delta' > 0$ and a finite set $K \subset C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ such that for any $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$,

1. $\mu(B(\mathcal{P}, \sqrt{\delta'})) < \delta$;
2. $\delta' < \delta$;
3. if $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ satisfies

$$\max_{k \in K} \left| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} k(x_i) - \int_{\mathscr{G}^0} k \, d\mu \right| < \delta'$$

   then
   - (a) $\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^F} |d^{-1} \#\{1 \leq i \leq d : \ x_i \in P\} - \mu(P)| < \delta$
   - (b) $d^{-1} \sum_{f \in F} \#\{1 \leq i \leq d : \ f^{-1} \cdot x_i \in B(\mathcal{P}, \sqrt{\delta'}) \text{ or } x_{\sigma(f)^{-1} i} \in B(\mathcal{P}, \sqrt{\delta'})\} \leq \delta.$

Item (3a) above uses that $\mathcal{P}^F$ has measure zero boundary.

For $y \in Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta', \rho)$, let $\phi^y : \Sigma(\mathcal{P}^F) \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta_d^0)$ be the homomorphism $\phi^y(P) = \{1 \le i \le d :\ y_i \in P\}$. We claim that $\phi^y \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, 2\delta)$. Indeed, for each $P \in \mathcal{P}^F$,

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^F} |d^{-1}|\phi^y(P)| - \mu(P)| < \delta$$

follows from the choice of K, δ'.

Suppose $1 \le i \le d$, $f \in F$ and $\mathcal{P}(f^{-1} \cdot y_i) \ne \mathcal{P}(y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i})$. If $f^{-1} \cdot y_i$ or $y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i} \notin B(\mathcal{P}, \sqrt{\delta'})$ then $\rho(f^{-1} \cdot y_i, y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i}) \ge \sqrt{\delta'}$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
(\delta')^2 &\ge \rho_2(f^{-1} \cdot y, y \circ \sigma(f)^{-1})^2 \\
&\ge d^{-1}\delta'|\{1 \le i \le d :\ f^{-1} \cdot y_i \text{ or } y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i} \notin B(\mathcal{P}, \sqrt{\delta'}), \mathcal{P}(f^{-1} \cdot y_i) \ne \mathcal{P}(y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i})\}| \\
&\ge d^{-1}\delta'|\{1 \le i \le d :\ \mathcal{P}(f^{-1} \cdot y_i) \ne \mathcal{P}(y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i})\}| - \delta'\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that if $i \in \sigma_f \cdot \phi^y(P) \vartriangle \phi^y(f \cdot P)$ (for some $P \in \mathcal{P}$) then $\mathcal{P}(f^{-1} \cdot y_i) \ne \mathcal{P}(y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i})$. So

$$d^{-1} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\sigma_f \cdot \phi^y(P) \vartriangle \phi^y(f \cdot P)| \quad \le \quad d^{-1}|\{1 \le i \le d :\ \mathcal{P}(f^{-1} \cdot y_i) \ne \mathcal{P}(y_{\sigma(f)^{-1}i})\}| \le \delta' + \delta < 2\delta.$$

This implies $\phi^y \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, 2\delta)$.

Next suppose $y, z \in Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta', \rho)$ and $\rho_\infty(y, z) > \epsilon$. In other words, $\rho(y_i, z_i) > \epsilon$ for some i. Because the diameter of each partition element of $\mathcal{Q}$ is at most ϵ, ϕ^y restricted to $\Sigma(\mathcal{Q})$ is different from ϕ^z restricted to $\Sigma(\mathcal{Q})$. So the map $y \mapsto \phi^y$ takes any (ρ_∞, ϵ)-separated subset to a set of homomorphisms whose restrictions to $\Sigma(\mathcal{Q})$ are distinct. This proves $|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, 2\delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \ge N_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta', \rho), \rho_\infty)$ as claimed. □

Claim 1 and Theorem 8.3 imply

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \ge \inf_{\delta > 0} \inf_{F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}} \inf_{K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)} \lim_{j \to \beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_\mu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty)\|_{p, \mathbb{P}_j}.$$

We now take the infimum over all $\mathcal{P}$ with measure zero boundary, then the supremum over all $\mathcal{Q}$ with measure zero boundary, then the supremum over all $\epsilon > 0$ to obtain

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{G}^0)) \ge h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \rho).$$

The equality above holds because $\mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{G}^0)$ is π-generating by Lemma 8.4.

Claim 2. Let $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{G}^0)$ be a finite partition and $\kappa > 0$. By Lemma 7.8 there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \le h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) + \kappa$ for all finite measurable partitions $\mathcal{P}$

refining $\mathcal{Q}$. Given $\delta > 0$ and $K \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)$, there exist a finite partition $\mathcal{P} \ge \mathcal{Q}$ and $\eta, \delta' > 0$ such that for any $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ satisfying $F = F^{-1}$, $\mathfrak{s}(f), \mathfrak{r}(f) \in F$ $(\forall f \in F)$ and any (F, δ')-multiplicative $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$,

$$N_\epsilon(\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta'), \rho_{\mathcal{Q}}) \le N_\eta(Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty).$$

Moreover, η depends only on $\mathcal{Q}, \epsilon$, and $\mathcal{P}, \delta'$ depend only on $\mathcal{Q}, \epsilon, K, \delta$.

Proof of Claim 2. For $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\eta > 0$, let Q^η be the set of all $q \in Q$ such that there exists $x \in \mathscr{G}^0 \setminus Q$ with $\rho(q, x) \le \eta$. Choose $\eta > 0$ to be the largest number so that $\mu(Q^\eta) \le \epsilon/5$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. This is possible because $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{G}^0)$.

Let $\mathrm{diam}(\rho) := \max\{\rho(x, y) : x, y \in \mathscr{G}^0\}$. Choose a finite partition $\mathcal{P}$ and $\delta' > 0$ so that

1. $\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{P}$ and every atom of $\mathcal{P}$ has diameter at most $\delta/2$,
2. $Q^\eta \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P})$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$,
3. $\sqrt{100\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2\delta' + (\delta/2)^2} \le \delta$ and $\delta' < \epsilon/5$.
4. for any point $x \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ such that
$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\{1 \le i \le d : x_i \in P\}|d^{-1} - \mu(P)| < \delta'$$
we have
$$\max_{k \in K} \left| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d k(x_i) - \int_{\mathscr{G}^0} k \, d\mu \right| < \delta.$$

For each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, choose a basepoint $x_P \in P$. Given $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta')$, define $y^\phi \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ by $y^\phi_i = x_P$ if $i \in \phi(P)$. We claim that $y^\phi \in Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$. Indeed the choice of $\mathcal{P}, \delta'$ above implies

$$\max_{k \in K} \left| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d k(x_i) - \int_{\mathscr{G}^0} k \, d\mu \right| < \delta.$$

Because $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta')$,

1. $\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\sigma_f \cdot \phi(P) \vartriangle \phi(f \cdot P)|d^{-1} < \delta' \quad \forall f \in F$;
2. $\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^F} ||\phi(P)|d^{-1} - \mu(P)| < \delta'$.

Fix $f \in F$. For $x \in \mathscr{G}^0$, let $\mathcal{P}(x)$ be the element of $\mathcal{P}$ containing x. Note that if, for some i, $f \cdot y^\phi_i$ and $\sigma(f)i$ are well-defined but $\mathcal{P}(f \cdot y^\phi_i) = P \ne \mathcal{P}(y^\phi_{\sigma(f)i})$ then $\sigma(f)i \in \sigma(f)\phi(f^{-1} \cdot P) \setminus \phi(P)$. So

$$|\{i \in \Delta^0_d : y^\phi_i \in \mathfrak{s}(f), i \in \mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f)), \mathcal{P}(f \cdot y^\phi_i) \ne \mathcal{P}(y^\phi_{\sigma(f)i})\}|_d$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} |\sigma(f)\cdot\phi(f^{-1}\cdot P)\setminus\phi(P)|_d\\
&\le \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} |\phi(f^{-1}\cdot P)\setminus\sigma(f)^{-1}\phi(P)|_d\\
&\le \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} |\phi(f^{-1}\cdot P)\vartriangle\sigma(f)^{-1}\phi(P)|_d\\
&\le \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} |\phi(f^{-1}\cdot P)\vartriangle\sigma(f^{-1})\phi(P)|_d + |\sigma(f^{-1})\phi(P)\vartriangle\sigma(f)^{-1}\phi(P)|_d\\
&\le |\sigma(f^{-1})\vartriangle\sigma(f)^{-1}|_d + \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} |\phi(f^{-1}\cdot P)\vartriangle\sigma(f^{-1})\cdot\phi(P)|_d < 15\delta'+\delta' = 16\delta'.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds by Lemma 3.3. By Lemmas 3.3 and 9.6,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\{i\in\Delta_d^0:\ y_i^\phi\in\mathfrak{s}(f), i\notin\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))\}|_d + |\{i\in\Delta_d^0:\ y_i^\phi\notin\mathfrak{s}(f), i\in\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))\}|_d\\
\le\ & |\phi(\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f)))\vartriangle\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))|_d \le |\phi(\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f)))\vartriangle\sigma(\mathfrak{s}(f))|_d + |\sigma(\mathfrak{s}(f))\vartriangle\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))|_d\\
\le\ & 2\delta' + 10\delta' = 12\delta'.
\end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_2(fy^\phi, y^\phi\circ\sigma_f)^2 \ \le\ & d^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2|\{1\le i\le d:\ \mathcal{P}(fy_i^\phi)\ne\mathcal{P}(y^\phi_{\sigma(f)i})|\\
&+d^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2|\{i\in\Delta_d^0:\ y_i^\phi\in\mathfrak{s}(f), i\notin\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))\}|\\
&+d^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2|\{i\in\Delta_d^0:\ y_i^\phi\notin\mathfrak{s}(f), i\in\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))\}|\\
&+d^{-1}(\delta/2)^2|\{1\le i\le d:\ \mathcal{P}(fy_i^\phi)=\mathcal{P}(y^\phi_{\sigma(f)i})|\\
<\ & 100\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2\delta' + (\delta/2)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\rho_2(fy^\phi, y^\phi\circ\sigma_f) < \sqrt{100\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2\delta' + (\delta/2)^2} \le \delta.$$

This shows that $y^\phi \in Orb_\mu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho)$ as claimed.

We claim that if $\phi,\psi\in\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta')$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi,\psi)>\epsilon$ then $\rho_\infty(y^\phi,y^\psi)>\eta$. Indeed, there exists $Q\in\mathcal{Q}$ such that $|\phi(Q)\vartriangle\psi(Q)|_d>\epsilon$. Because $\phi,\psi\in\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta')$ and $Q^\eta\in\Sigma(\mathcal{P})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon\ &<\ |\phi(Q)\vartriangle\psi(Q)|_d\\
&=\ |\phi(Q\setminus Q^\eta)\setminus\psi(Q)| + |\psi(Q\setminus Q^\eta)\setminus\phi(Q)| + |\phi(Q^\eta)\setminus\psi(Q)| + |\psi(Q^\eta)\setminus\phi(Q)|\\
&\le\ |\phi(Q\setminus Q^\eta)\setminus\psi(Q)| + |\psi(Q\setminus Q^\eta)\setminus\phi(Q)| + 2\delta' + 2\mu(Q^\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $2\delta' + 2\mu(Q^\eta) < 4\epsilon/5$, we obtain that there exists $i \in (\phi(Q \setminus Q^\eta) \setminus \psi(Q)) \cup (\psi(Q \setminus Q^\eta) \setminus \phi(Q))$. Therefore, $\rho(y^\phi_i, y^\psi_i) > \eta$ which implies the claim.

So the map $\phi \mapsto y^\phi$ takes $(\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}, \epsilon)$-separated subsets of $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta')$ to (ρ_∞, η)-separated subsets of $Orb_\mu(\pi, \sigma, F, K, \delta, \rho)$. This proves Claim 2. □

Claim 2 implies

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}) - \kappa \le h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}) \le h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta') &= \lim_{j \to \beta} d_j^{-1} \log \|N_\epsilon(Hom_\mu(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F, \delta'), \rho_{\mathcal{Q}})\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} \\ &\le \lim_{j \to \beta} d_j^{-1} \log \|N_\eta(Orb_\mu(\pi, \cdot, F, K, \delta, \rho), \rho_\infty)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}. \end{aligned}$$

We can now take the infimum over F, K, δ and then the supremum over η to obtain $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}) - \kappa \le h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \rho)$. Because $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{G}^0), \kappa > 0$ are arbitrary, this implies

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{G}^0)) \quad \le \quad h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \rho)$$

where the equality holds because $\mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{G}^0)$ is π-generating by Lemma 8.4. As we have already obtained the opposite inequality, this proves the theorem. □

10. THE VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE

Theorem 10.1. *Let $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ be a pmp separable étale topological discrete groupoid, $\mathscr{G}$ be a separable topological discrete groupoid, $\pi : \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ a continuous class-bijective factor, and $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_j\}_{j \in J}$ an asymptotically continuous sofic approximation to $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ (definition 8.1). We assume both $\mathscr{H}^0$ and $\mathscr{G}^0$ are compact and metrizable and ν is regular. Then for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ and bias $\beta \ne -$,*

$$h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi) = \sup_\mu h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi)$$

where the supremum is over all measures μ on $\mathscr{G}$ such that $\pi_*\mu = \nu$ and $(\mathscr{G}, \mu)$ is probability-measure-preserving.

Before proving this, we need a few lemmas. The first is a generalization of the Feldman-Moore Theorem [FM77].

Lemma 10.2. *Let $\mathscr{H}$ be a discrete measurable groupoid. Then there exists a countable subgroup $H < [\mathscr{H}]$ such that for every $g \in \mathscr{H}$ there exists $h \in H$ with $g \in h$.*

Proof. Let $E_{\mathscr{H}}$ be the equivalence relation on $\mathscr{H}^0$ given by $(x,y) \in E_{\mathscr{H}} \Leftrightarrow \exists g \in \mathscr{H}$ such that $g \cdot x = y$. It follows from [FM77, Theorem 1] that there is a countable subgroup $H' < [\mathscr{H}]$ such that for every $(x,y) \in E_{\mathscr{H}}$ there is an $h \in H'$ with $hx = y$.

Let $\mathscr{K} = \{g \in \mathscr{H} :\ \mathfrak{s}(g) = \mathfrak{r}(g)\}$. By Kuratowski [Ku33, §39, III, Corollary 5], there is a countable Borel partition $\{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ of $\mathscr{K}$ such that for each i, $\mathfrak{s}|_{P_i}$ is injective. For each i, define $B_i = P_i \cup (\mathscr{H}^0 \setminus \mathfrak{s}(P_i))$. Note $B_i \in [\mathscr{H}]$. We claim that the group H generated by H' and $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies the lemma. So let $g \in \mathscr{H}$. If $g \in \mathscr{K}$ then $g \in P_i$ for some i and so $g \in B_i \in H$. Suppose $g \notin \mathscr{K}$. Let $x = \mathfrak{s}(g), y = \mathfrak{r}(g)$ so that $g \cdot x = y$. Then there exists $f \in \mathscr{H}$ and $h \in H'$ with $f \in h$, $f \cdot x = y$. Observe that $g = f(f^{-1}g)$ and $f^{-1}g \in \mathscr{K}$. So there is $B_j \in H$ with $f^{-1}g \in B_j$. So $g \in hB_j \in H$. Because g is arbitrary, this proves the lemma. □

Next we show that it suffices to consider measures μ on $\mathscr{G}^0$ that are $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$-invariant. To be precise:

Proposition 10.3. *Let $(\mathscr{H},\nu), \mathscr{G}$ be as in Theorem 10.1. Let μ be a Borel probability measure on $\mathscr{G}^0$ and suppose that μ is $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$-invariant in the sense that $\mu(k \circ f) = \mu(k \circ \mathfrak{r}(f))$ for every continuous function $k \in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ and $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ (where, for example, $\mu(k \circ f) = \int_{\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))} k(f \cdot x)\ d\mu(x)$). Then $(\mathscr{G},\mu)$ probability-measure-preserving.*

Proof. By a standard argument, it suffices to show that μ is $[\mathscr{G}]$-invariant. We first show that μ is $[\mathscr{H}]$-invariant. By Lemma 8.5, $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ is dense in $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$. In particular, if $f \in [\mathscr{H}]$, $\epsilon > 0$ then there exists $f' \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ with $\nu(f \vartriangle f') < \epsilon$. So if $k \in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ and

$$R = \{x \in \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f) \cap \mathfrak{s}(f')) :\ f \cdot x \neq f' \cdot x\} \cup \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f) \vartriangle \mathfrak{s}(f'))$$

then

$$|\mu(k \circ f) - \mu(k \circ f')| \le 2\|k\|_\infty \mu(R) \le 2\epsilon \|k\|_\infty.$$

Similarly, $|\mu(k \circ \mathfrak{r}(f)) - \mu(k \circ \mathfrak{r}(f'))| \le 2\epsilon\|k\|_\infty$ which implies (by $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$-invariance) that $|\mu(k \circ f) - \mu(k \circ \mathfrak{r}(f)| \le 4\epsilon\|k\|_\infty$. Since ϵ is arbitrary and $\mathfrak{r}(f) = \mathscr{H}^0$, $\mu(k \circ f) = \mu(k)$. Since f, k are arbitrary, μ is $[\mathscr{H}]$-invariant.

Now let $\psi \in [\mathscr{G}]$. We will show $\psi_*\mu = \mu$. Let $H < [\mathscr{H}]$ be as in Lemma 10.2. Recall that $\pi^{-1} : [\mathscr{H}] \to [\mathscr{G}]$ is a homomorphism.

Let us enumerate H by $H = \{h_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. Let

$$P_i = \{x \in \mathscr{G}^0 :\ \psi \cap \mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) = \pi^{-1}(h_i) \cap \mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) \text{ and } i \text{ is minimal with this property}\}.$$

Because π is class-bijective, $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a Borel partition of $\mathscr{G}^0$. We have shown that μ is $\pi^{-1}(H)$-invariant and therefore, each $\pi^{-1}(h_i)$ restricted to P_i preserves μ. Since ψ is the disjoint union of $\pi^{-1}(h_i) \cdot P_i$, this shows that ψ is measure-preserving. Because ψ is arbitrary, μ is $[\mathscr{G}]$-invariant which implies the lemma.

□

Definition 10.4. Let $M(\mathscr{G}^0)$ denote the space of Borel probability measures on $\mathscr{G}^0$ with the weak* topology. To be precise, this is the weakest topology with the property that for every continuous function $k \in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$, the map $\mu \in M(\mathscr{G}^0) \mapsto \int k \, d\mu$ is continuous.

In order to show that the measures we obtain in the proof of Theorem 10.1 are $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$-invariant we need the following continuity result:

Proposition 10.5. *Suppose that Ω is a directed set and $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto \mu_\omega \in M(\mathscr{G}^0)$ is a map such that $\lim_{\omega\to\Omega} \mu_\omega = \mu_\infty$. Suppose as well that $\pi_*\mu_\infty = \nu$. Then for any $k \in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ and $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$,*

$$\lim_{\omega\to\Omega} \mu_\omega(k \circ f) = \mu_\infty(k \circ f).$$

First we need a helpful lemma:

Lemma 10.6. *For any $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$, there exist $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ and bisections $U_1, \ldots, U_n$ such that*

- *$f = \cup_{i=1}^n f_i$;*
- *$\{\mathfrak{s}(f_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are pairwise disjoint and $\{\mathfrak{r}(f_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are pairwise disjoint;*
- *the closure of f_i is contained in U_i (for each i).*

Proof. It suffices to consider the special case in which there is a bisection U with $f \subset U$. Because $\mathscr{H}$ is étale and $\mathscr{H}^0$ is compact and metrizable, for each $g \in \mathscr{H}$ there exist bisections V_g, U_g such that $g \in V_g \subset \overline{V_g} \subset U_g$. Because $\overline{\mathfrak{s}(f)}$ is compact, there exist elements $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in \mathscr{H}$ such that $\overline{\mathfrak{s}(f)} \subset \cup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{s}(V_{g_i})$. Let $f_i = f \cap V_{g_i}$ and $U_i = U_{g_i}$. It is an exercise to check that all of the conditions are met. □

Proof of Proposition 10.5. Consider the function $F : M(\mathscr{G}^0) \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by $F(\mu) = \mu(k \circ f)$. It suffices to show that F is continuous at μ_∞. By decomposing k into its real and imaginary parts and then into positive and negative parts, we see that it suffices to consider the case $k \geq 0$. By the previous lemma, it suffices to consider the special case in which $\overline{f} \subset U$ for some bisection U.

We first show that F is lower semi-continuous at μ_∞. Let ρ be a continuous metric on $\mathscr{G}^0$. For each integer n, let

$$\begin{aligned} O_n &:= \{x \in \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f)) :\ \rho(x, \partial \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))) > 1/n\} \\ K_n &:= \{x \in \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f)) :\ \rho(x, \partial \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))) \geq 2/n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that O_n is open, K_n is compact and $K_n \subset O_n \subset \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))$. By Urysohn's Lemma, there exists a continuous function $p_n : \mathscr{G}^0 \to [0,1]$ such that $p_n(x) = 1$ for all $x \in K_n$ and $p_n(x) = 0$ for all $x \notin O_n$. Note $p_n \cdot k \leq k \circ \mathfrak{s}(f)$ on $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))$. Moreover, because $\mathfrak{s}(f) \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ and $\pi_*\mu_\infty = \nu$, we must have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_\infty(p_n k \circ f) = \sup_n \mu_\infty(p_n k \circ f) = \mu_\infty(k \circ f).$$

Because f is contained in a bisection, $p_n k \circ f$ is continuous (where, by abuse of notation, we define $p_n k \circ f(x) = 0$ if $x \notin \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))$). By definition of the weak* topology, this means F is lower semi-continuous at μ_∞ (because it is a supremum of continuous functions at μ_∞).

The proof that F is upper semi-continuous is similar. Recall that $\overline{f} \subset U$ where U is a bisection. For each integer n, let

$$O'_n \ := \ \{x \in \mathscr{G}^0 :\ \rho(x, \partial \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))) > 1/n\} \cap \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(U)).$$

Note $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(U)) \supset O'_n \supset \pi^{-1}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}(f)}) \supset \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))$. Moreover O'_n is open and $\pi^{-1}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}(f)})$ is compact. By Urysohn's Lemma, there exists a continuous function $q_n : \mathscr{G}^0 \to [0,1]$ such that $q_n(x) = 0$ for every $x \notin O'_n$ and $q_n(x) = 1$ for every $x \in \pi^{-1}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}(f)})$. Note $q_n \cdot k \geq k \circ \mathfrak{s}(f)$ on $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f))$. Moreover, because $\mathfrak{s}(f) \in \mathcal{B}_\partial(\mathscr{H}^0, \nu)$ and $\pi_*\mu_\infty = \nu$, we must have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_\infty(q_n k \circ U) = \inf_n \mu_\infty(q_n k \circ U) = \mu_\infty(k \circ f).$$

Because f is contained in a bisection U with $O'_n \subset \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(U))$, $q_n k \circ U$ is continuous (where, by abuse of notation, we define $q_n k \circ U(x) = 0$ if $x \notin \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(U))$). By definition of the weak* topology, this means F is upper semi-continuous at μ_∞ (because it is an infimum of continuous functions at μ_∞).

Because F is both lower and upper semi-continuous at μ_∞, it is continuous at μ_∞. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 10.1. Let ρ be a continuous metric on $\mathscr{G}^0$. Theorem 9.5 implies $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi) \ge \sup_\mu h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho) = \sup_\mu h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi) > -\infty$.

Let $\kappa > 0$. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) \ge h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) - \kappa$$

where

$$h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) := \inf_{\delta>0} \inf_{F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}} \inf_{K \subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)} \lim_{j\to\beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F,K,\delta,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.$$

Let $\Omega = \{(F,L,\delta) :\ F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}, L \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0), \delta > 0\}$. We consider Ω as a directed set by declaring $(F,L,\delta) \le (F',L',\delta')$ if $F' \supset F, L' \supset L, \delta' \le \delta$. Given $\omega \in \Omega$, we write $\omega = (F_\omega, L_\omega, \delta_\omega)$ and we set $K_\omega = \{k \in C(\mathscr{H}^0) :\ k \circ \pi \in L_\omega\}$. Let $M(\mathscr{G}^0)$ denote the space of Borel probability measures on $\mathscr{G}^0$.

Claim 1. There exists a directed net $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto \mu_\omega \in M(\mathscr{G}^0)$ such that

1. $h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu_\omega}(\pi,\rho,\omega,2) \ge h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2)$ where
$$\begin{aligned} h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu_\omega}(\pi,\rho,\omega,2) &:= h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu_\omega}(\pi,\rho,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,2) \\ &:= \lim_{j\to\beta} \frac{1}{d_j} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_{\mu_\omega}(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}. \end{aligned}$$
2. $\lim_{\omega\to\Omega} |\mu_\omega(k \circ f) - \mu_\omega(k \circ \mathfrak{r}(f))| = 0, \quad \forall f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}, k \in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$.
3. $\lim_{\omega\to\Omega} |\mu_\omega(k \circ \pi) - \nu(k)| = 0, \quad \forall k \in C(\mathscr{H}^0)$.

Proof of Theorem 10.1 given Claim 1. Let μ be a weak* accumulation point of $\{\mu_\omega :\ \omega \in \Omega\}$. By (3) $\pi_*\mu = \nu$. By (2) and Proposition 10.5, $\mu(k \circ f) = \mu(k \circ \mathfrak{r}(f))$ for every $f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}, k \in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$. By Proposition 10.3, $(\mathscr{G},\mu)$ is probability-measure-preserving.

Let $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}, L \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ and $\delta > 0$. Choose $\omega \in \Omega$ to satisfy

1. $|\mu(k) - \mu_\omega(k)| \le \delta/2\ \forall k \in L$;
2. $F \subset F_\omega$, $L \subset L_\omega$, $\delta_\omega \le \delta/2$.

Then for any $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, $x \in Orb_{\mu_\omega}(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho)$ and $k \in L$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d k(x_i) - \mu(k) \right| \quad \le \quad \left| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d k(x_i) - \mu_\omega(k) \right| + |\mu_\omega(k) - \mu(k)| < \delta.$$

Therefore,

$$Orb_{\mu_\omega}(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho) \subset Orb_\mu(\pi,\sigma,F,L,\delta,\rho).$$

So

$$h^{\epsilon}_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho,F,L,\delta,2) \ge h^{\epsilon}_{\mathbb{P},\mu_\omega}(\pi,\rho,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,2) \ge h^{\epsilon}_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2).$$

By taking the infimum over F, L, δ we obtain

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho,2) \ge h^{\epsilon}_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\rho,2) \ge h^{\epsilon}_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) \ge h_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2) - \kappa.$$

Because $\kappa > 0$ is arbitrary, this implies the Theorem. $\square$

It remains to prove Claim 1. For $L \subset_f C(\mathscr{G}^0)$ and $\delta > 0$, let $M(L,\delta)$ be the set of all $\mu \in M(\mathscr{G}^0)$ such that $|\mu(k \circ \pi) - \nu(k)| \le \delta$ for all $k \in C(\mathscr{H}^0)$ with $k \circ \pi \in L$. For $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ let $D(F,L,\delta) \subset M(L,\delta)$ be a finite set such that for every $\lambda \in M(L,\delta)$ there exists a $\mu \in D(F,L,\delta)$ such that

$$|\mu(k \circ f) - \lambda(k \circ f)| < \delta \quad \forall f \in F, k \in L.$$

For every $x \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d$ let $m_x \in M(\mathscr{G}^0)$ be the measure $m_x = d^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^d \delta_{x_i}$ where δ_{x_i} is the Dirac measure concentrated on x_i. For every $\omega \in \Omega$, choose a Borel map $x \in \{y \in (\mathscr{G}^0)^d : \ m_y \in M(L_\omega,\delta_\omega)\} \mapsto \mu_{x,\omega} \in D(\omega)$ satisfying

$$|\mu_{x,\omega}(k \circ f) - m_x(k \circ f)| < \delta_\omega \quad \forall f \in F_\omega, k \in L_\omega.$$

For every $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$, $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}, K \subset_f C(\mathscr{H}^0)$ and $\delta > 0$, choose a maximum (ρ_2,ϵ)-separated subset $Q(\sigma,F,K,\delta) \subset Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F,K,\delta,\rho)$ so that for every d_j, the map $\sigma \in \mathrm{Map}([\![\mathscr{H}]\!],[\![d_j]\!]) \mapsto Q(\sigma,F,K,\delta)$ is Borel.

By the Pigeonhole Principle for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $j \in J$ there exists $\mu_{j,\omega} \in D(\omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\#\{x \in Q(\cdot,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega) : \ \mu_{j,\omega} = \mu_{x,\omega}\}\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} &\ge \frac{\|\#Q(\cdot,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}}{|D(\omega)|} \\ &= \frac{\|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}}{|D(\omega)|}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we choose $\mu_\omega \in D(\omega)$ so that if $J' = \{j \in J : \ \mu_{j,\omega} = \mu_\omega\}$ then either $J' \in \beta$ (if β is an ultrafilter on J) or J' is cofinal. In the case $\beta = +$ we also require that

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{j\in J} d_j^{-1} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_{\mu_{j,\omega}}(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} \\ &= \limsup_{j\in J'} d_j^{-1} \log \|N_\epsilon(Orb_{\mu_{j,\omega}}(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Such a choice is possible because $D(\omega)$ is finite.

We will show that the measures $\{\mu_\omega:\ \omega\in\Omega\}$ satisfy Claim 1. First, note that for any $j\in J$, $\omega\in\Omega$, if $x\in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho)$ and $\mu_{x,\omega}=\mu_{j,\omega}$ then

$$|m_x(k)-\mu_{j,\omega}(k)|<\delta_\omega\quad\forall k\in L_\omega$$

implies $x\in Orb_{\mu_{j,\omega}}(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho)$. Therefore

$$N_\epsilon(Orb_{\mu_{j,\omega}}(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\ge|\{x\in Q(\sigma,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega):\ \mu_{j,\omega}=\mu_{x,\omega}\}|.$$

By choice of $\mu_{j,\omega}$ this implies,

$$\|N_\epsilon(Orb_{\mu_{j,\omega}}(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}\ge\frac{\|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}}{|D(\omega)|}.$$

Now the choice of μ_ω implies

$$\begin{aligned}h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P},\mu_\omega}(\pi,\rho,\omega,2)&\ge\lim_{j\to\beta}d_j^{-1}\log\|N_\epsilon(Orb_{\mu_{j,\omega}}(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,L_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}\\&\ge\lim_{j\to\beta}d_j^{-1}\log\|N_\epsilon(Orb_\nu(\pi,\cdot,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho),\rho_2)\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}\\&\ge h^\epsilon_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi,\rho,2).\end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality above, we used that $\beta\ne -$. This proves the first item of Claim 1.

To prove the second item, let $k\in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$, $f\in[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}$ and $\eta>0$ be a constant. Because k is continuous, there exists a constant $\delta>0$ such that if $x,y\in\mathscr{G}^0$ satisfy $\rho(x,y)<\delta$ then $|k(x)-k(y)|<\eta$.

Let $\omega\in\Omega$ be such that $k\in L_\omega, f,f^{-1},\mathfrak{r}(f)\in F_\omega$ and δ_ω is small enough so that $\frac{\delta_\omega^2}{\delta^2}<\eta$. By choice of μ_ω, there exist a $(F_\omega,\delta_\omega^2/(100\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2)$-multiplicative $\sigma:[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]\to[\![d]\!]$ and $x\in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho)$ such that $\mu_{x,\omega}=\mu_\omega$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu_\omega(k\circ f)-\mu_\omega(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))|&\le|\mu_\omega(k\circ f)-m_x(k\circ f)|+|m_x(k\circ f)-m_x(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))|\\&\quad+|m_x(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))-\mu_\omega(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))|\\&<2\delta_\omega+|m_x(k\circ f)-m_x(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))|\\&\le2\delta_\omega+|m_x(k\circ f)-m_{x\circ\sigma(f)}(k)|+|m_{x\circ\sigma(f)}(k)-m_x(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))|.\end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate $|m_x(k\circ f)-m_{x\circ\sigma(f)}(k)|$. Because $x\in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho)$,

$$\delta_\omega^2\ >\ \rho_2(f\cdot x,x\circ\sigma(f))^2\ge d^{-1}|\{1\le i\le d:\ \rho(f\cdot x_i,x_{\sigma(f)i})\ge\delta\}|\delta^2.$$

So,

$$\eta>\frac{\delta_\omega^2}{\delta^2}\ge d^{-1}|\{1\le i\le d:\ \rho(f\cdot x_i,x_{\sigma(f)i})\ge\delta\}|$$

which implies (by choice of δ)

$$|m_x(k \circ f) - m_{x\circ\sigma(f)}(k)| \le d^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{d} |k(f\cdot x_i) - k(x_{\sigma(f)i})| \le 2\eta + 2\eta\|k\|_\infty.$$

Next we estimate $|m_{x\circ\sigma(f)}(k) - m_x(k\circ \mathfrak{r}(f))|$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{x\circ\sigma(f)}(k) - m_x(k\circ \mathfrak{r}(f))| &= d^{-1}\left|\sum_{i\in\mathfrak{s}(\sigma(f))} k(x_{\sigma(f)i}) - \sum_{i:\ x_i\in\mathfrak{r}(f)} k(x_i)\right| \\ &= d^{-1}\left|\sum_{i\in\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f))} k(x_i) - \sum_{i:\ x_i\in\mathfrak{r}(f)} k(x_i)\right| \\ &\le d^{-1}\|k\|_\infty |\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \{i:\ x_i\in\mathfrak{r}(f)\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Because $x \in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\omega^2 &> \rho_2(x\circ\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f)), \mathfrak{r}(f)\cdot x)^2 = d^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{d}\rho(x_{\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f))i}, \mathfrak{r}(f)\cdot x_i)^2 \\ &\ge d^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2 |\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f))) \vartriangle \{i:\ x_i\in\mathfrak{r}(f)\}| \\ &\ge d^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2 |\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \{i:\ x_i\in\mathfrak{r}(f)\}| - \delta_\omega^2 \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.3. So

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{x\circ\sigma(f)}(k) - m_x(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))| &\le d^{-1}\|k\|_\infty |\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(f)) \vartriangle \{i:\ x_i\in\mathfrak{r}(f)\}| \\ &\le d^{-1}\|k\|_\infty \frac{2\delta_\omega^2}{d^{-1}\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2} = \frac{2\delta_\omega^2\|k\|_\infty}{\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The previous estimates now imply

$$|\mu_\omega(k\circ f) - \mu_\omega(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))| \le 2\delta_\omega + 2\eta + 2\eta\|k\|_\infty + \frac{2\delta_\omega^2\|k\|_\infty}{\mathrm{diam}(\rho)^2}.$$

Because η, f, k are arbitrary, this implies

$$\lim_{\omega\to\Omega} |\mu_\omega(k\circ f) - \mu_\omega(k\circ\mathfrak{r}(f))| = 0, \quad \forall f \in [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]_{top}, k \in C(\mathscr{G}^0)$$

as required.

To prove the third item of Claim 1, let $k \in C(\mathscr{H}^0)$. Let $\omega \in \Omega$ be such that $k \in K_\omega$ (i.e., $k\circ\pi \in L_\omega$). By choice of μ_ω, there exists $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ and $x \in Orb_\nu(\pi,\sigma,F_\omega,K_\omega,\delta_\omega,\rho)$ such that $\mu_{x,\omega} = \mu_\omega$. Therefore,

$$|\mu_\omega(k\circ\pi) - \nu(k)| \le |\mu_\omega(k\circ\pi) - m_x(k\circ\pi)| + |m_x(k\circ\pi) - \nu(k)| < 2\delta_\omega.$$

Thus $\lim_{\omega\to\Omega}|\mu_\omega(k\circ\pi)-\nu(k)|=0$ as required. □

11. BERNOULLI SHIFTS

Let $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be a pmp discrete groupoid and (K,κ) be a standard probability space. The *Bernoulli shift* over $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ with base space (K,κ) is a class-bijective pmp extension $\pi:(\mathscr{G},\mu)\to(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ constructed as follows. An element of $\mathscr{G}^0$ is a pair (x,ω) where $x\in\mathscr{H}^0$ and $\omega\in K^{\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x)}$, which denotes the set of all functions $\omega:\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x)\to K$. The measure on $\mathscr{G}^0$ is defined by

$$d\mu(x,\omega)=d\kappa^{\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x)}(\omega)d\nu(x)$$

where $\kappa^{\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x)}$ is the product measure on $K^{\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x)}$.

Define $\pi:\mathscr{G}^0\to\mathscr{H}^0$ to be the projection map $\pi(x,\omega)=x$. The elements of $\mathscr{G}$ are triples (h,ω) where, if $x=\mathfrak{s}(h)$ then $(x,\omega)\in\mathscr{G}^0$. The source and range maps are defined by $\mathfrak{s}(h,\omega)=(\mathfrak{s}(h),\omega)$, $\mathfrak{r}(h,\omega)=(y,\psi)$ where $\mathfrak{r}(h)=y$ and $\psi:\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(y)\to K$ is defined by $\psi(f):=\omega(fh)$. The composition map is defined by $(f,\psi)(h,\omega)=(fh,\omega)$. The main result of this section is:

Theorem 11.1. *Let $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be any pmp groupoid, $\pi:(\mathscr{G},\mu)\to(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be the Bernoulli shift over $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ with base space (K,κ). Then $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi)=H(K,\kappa)$ where $H(K,\kappa):=-\sum_{k\in K'}\mu(\{k\})\log(\mu(\{k\}))$ where K' is any countable subset of K with $\kappa(K')=1$. If no such countable set exists then $H(K,\kappa):=+\infty$.*

We first identify a generating sigma-algebra.

Lemma 11.2. *Let $\pi:(\mathscr{G},\mu)\to(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ and (K,κ) be as in Theorem 11.1. Let $E:\mathscr{G}^0\to K$ be the evaluation map $E(x,\omega):=\omega(x)$. Let $\mathcal{F}=E^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_K)$ be the inverse image of the Borel sigma-algebra $\mathcal{B}_K$ of K. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is π-generating.*

Proof. Let $\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{F})$ be the smallest sigma-sub-algebra of Borel subsets of $\mathscr{G}^0$ containing $\{f\cdot P:\ f\in[\![\mathscr{H}]\!],P\in\mathcal{F}\}$. For every Borel set $Q\subset\mathscr{H}^0$, we have $Q\in[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $Q\cdot\mathscr{G}^0=\pi^{-1}(Q)$. It follows that $\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{F})$ contains $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{H}^0))$ where $\mathcal{B}(\mathscr{H}^0)$ is the Borel sigma-algebra on $\mathscr{H}^0$. Therefore, $\pi:\mathscr{G}^0\to\mathscr{H}^0$ is $\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{F})$-measurable. Because the Borel sigma-algebra of $\mathscr{G}^0$ is generated by π and $\{E\circ f:\ f\in[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]\}$, this implies the lemma. □

Next we show that the inequality $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi)\le H(K,\kappa)$ holds under general conditions.

Lemma 11.3. *Let* $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ *be any discrete pmp groupoid, and* $\pi : (\mathscr{G},\mu) \to (\mathscr{H},\nu)$ *any pmp class-bijective extension. For any finite Borel partitions* $\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{P}$ *of* $\mathscr{G}^0$ *we have*

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P}) \le H_\mu(\mathcal{Q}) := -\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} \mu(Q)\log\mu(Q).$$

Proof. We will use the partition definition of measure entropy. Let $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ be a map, $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ with $\mathscr{H}^0 \in F$ and $\delta > 0$. Let $\Psi : \mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta) \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{Q}}$ be the map $\Psi(\phi)(Q) := |\phi(Q)|$ (for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$).

For each $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)$, $|d^{-1}|\phi(Q)| - \mu(Q)| \le \delta$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. So $\Psi(\phi)(Q) \in [(\mu(Q)-\delta)d, (\mu(Q)+\delta)d]$. Therefore

$$|\Psi(\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta))| \le (2\delta d)^{|\mathcal{Q}|}.$$

If v is in the image of Ψ then by Stirling's approximation

$$|\Psi^{-1}(v)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \le \prod_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} \binom{d}{v(Q)} \le \exp(H_\mu(\mathcal{Q})d + \delta' d)$$

where $\delta' > 0$ and $\delta' \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$. We now have

$$|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\sigma,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}} = \sum_{v\in\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{Q}}} |\Psi^{-1}(v)|_{\mathcal{Q}} \le (2\delta d)^{|\mathcal{Q}|}\exp(H_\mu(\mathcal{Q})d + \delta' d).$$

Therefore,

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P},F,\delta) = \lim_{j\to\beta} d_j^{-1}\log \||\mathrm{Hom}(\pi,\cdot,\mathcal{P},F,\delta)|_{\mathcal{Q}}\|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j} \le H_\mu(\mathcal{Q}) + \delta'.$$

Because $\delta' \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ and F is arbitrary, this proves $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{P}) \le H_\mu(\mathcal{Q})$. □

Corollary 11.4. *Let* $\pi : (\mathscr{G},\mu) \to (\mathscr{H},\nu)$ *and* (K,κ) *be as in Theorem 11.1. Then* $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) \le H(K,\kappa)$.

Proof. By Lemma 11.2, $E^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_K) = \mathcal{F}$ is π-generating. By Lemma 11.3, for any finite Borel partitions $\mathcal{Q} \le \mathcal{P}$ of K we have

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, E^{-1}(\mathcal{Q}), E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})) \le H_\kappa(\mathcal{Q}).$$

Take the infimum over all such $\mathcal{P}$ and then the supremum over all such $\mathcal{Q}$ to obtain

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi,\mathcal{F}) \le H(K,\kappa).$$

The first equality above is Theorem 7.5. □

The next lemma shows that there is at least one good homomorphism for the trivial partition if σ is sufficiently good.

Lemma 11.5. *Let* $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ *be a discrete pmp groupoid,* $\pi_0 : \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{H}$ *the identity map and* $\mathbb{P}$ *a sofic approximation to* $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$*. Then* $h_{\mathbb{P},\nu}(\pi_0) = 0$*. Moreover, for every* $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ *and* $\delta > 0$ *there exists* $F' \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ *and* $\delta' > 0$ *such that if* σ *is* (F',δ')*-multiplicative and* (F',δ')*-trace preserving then* $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_0,\sigma,\mathcal{T},F,\delta) \neq \emptyset$ *where* $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathscr{H}^0,\emptyset\}$ *is the trivial partition of* $\mathscr{H}^0$*.*

Proof. Observe that $\mathcal{T}$ is π_0-generating. So Theorem 7.5 implies

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\nu}(\pi_0) = \inf_{F\subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]} \inf_{\delta>0} \lim_{j\to\beta} d_j^{-1} \log \| |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_0,\cdot,\mathcal{T},F,\delta)|_{\mathcal{T}} \|_{p,\mathbb{P}_j}.$$

Because $|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_0,\cdot,\mathcal{T},F,\delta)|_{\mathcal{T}} \le 1$ for every σ, F, δ, we must have $h_{\mathbb{P},\nu}(\pi_0) \le 0$.

It may be useful to review the notation in Example 2.5. Let $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$, $\delta > 0$ and $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$. Observe that $\mathcal{T}^F$ is the smallest partition of $\mathscr{H}^0$ containing $\mathfrak{r}(f)$ for every $f \in F$. Define $\phi : \Sigma(\mathcal{T}^F) \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta_d^0)$ as follows. First enumerate $\mathcal{T}^F = \{P_1,\dots,P_n\}$. Define $\phi(P_1) = \sigma(P_1)\cap\Delta_d^0$ and inductively define

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(P_i) &= (\sigma(P_i)\cap\Delta_d^0) \setminus \bigcup_{1\le j<i} \phi(P_j) \quad 1 \le i < n\\ \phi(P_n) &= \Delta_d^0 \setminus \bigcup_{1\le j<n} \phi(P_j).\end{aligned}$$

For $I \subset \{1,\dots,n\}$, let $\phi(\cup_{i\in I} P_i) = \cup_{i\in I}\phi(P_i)$.

Claim 1. Let $0 < \delta' < (1/11)\delta|\mathcal{T}^F|^{-2}$. If σ is $(\mathcal{T}^F,\delta')$-multiplicative and $(\mathcal{T}^F,\delta')$-trace preserving then $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_0,\sigma,\mathcal{T},F,\delta)$.

Proof of Claim 1. If $P, Q \in \mathcal{T}^F$ and $P \neq Q$ then $P\cap Q = \emptyset$. So $PQ = \emptyset$. Because σ is $(\mathcal{T}^F,\delta')$-multiplicative,

$$\delta' \ \ge \ |\sigma(P)\sigma(Q) \vartriangle \sigma(PQ)|_d = |\sigma(P)\sigma(Q)|_d.$$

If $i < n$ then

$$\phi(P_i) \vartriangle (\sigma(P_i)\cap\Delta_d^0) \subset \bigcup_{j<i} \phi(P_i) \vartriangle \phi(P_j) \subset \bigcup_{j<i} \sigma(P_i)\sigma(P_j).$$

So $|\phi(P_i) \triangle (\sigma(P_i) \cap \Delta_d^0)|_d \leq \delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|$. On the other hand,

$$\phi(P_n) \triangle (\sigma(P_n) \cap \Delta_d^0) \quad \subset \quad \sigma(P_n) \cap \Delta_d^0 \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i<n} \phi(P_i) \right) = \Delta_d^0 \cap \left(\bigcup_{i<n} \sigma(P_n) \triangle \sigma(P_i) \right).$$

So $|\phi(P_i) \triangle (\sigma(P_i) \cap \Delta_d^0)|_d \leq \delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore, $|\phi(P) \triangle (\sigma(P) \cap \Delta_d^0)|_d \leq \delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|^2$ for any $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{T}^F)$. By Lemma 3.3, for any $f \in F$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{T}} |\sigma_f \cdot \phi(P) \triangle \phi(f \cdot P)|_d \quad &= \quad |\mathfrak{r}(\sigma_f) \triangle \phi(\mathfrak{r}(f))|_d \leq |\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f)) \triangle \phi(\mathfrak{r}(f))|_d + 10\delta' \\ &\leq \quad |\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f)) \triangle (\sigma(\mathfrak{r}(f)) \cap \Delta_d^0)|_d + 10\delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|^2 \leq 11\delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|^2 < \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Because σ is (F', δ')-trace-preserving, $|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(P) - \mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma(P))| \leq \delta$ for every $P \in \mathcal{T}^F$. By definition, for $P \subset \mathscr{H}^0$, $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(P) = \nu(P)$ and $|\sigma(P) \cap \Delta_d^0|_d = \mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma(P))$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{T}^F} ||\phi(P)| d^{-1} - \nu(P)| \quad &\leq \quad \delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|^2 + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{T}^F} ||\sigma(P) \cap \Delta_d^0|_d - \mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(P)| \\ &= \quad \delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|^2 + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{T}^F} |\mathrm{tr}_d(\sigma(P)) - \mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(P)| \leq 2\delta' |\mathcal{T}^F|^2 < \delta. \end{aligned}$$

This implies Claim 1. □

Claim 1 and the definition of sofic approximation implies

$$\lim_{j \to \beta} |||\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_0, \cdot, \mathcal{T}, F, \delta)|||_{p, \mathbb{P}_j} = 1.$$

Therefore $h_{\mathbb{P},\nu}(\pi_0) \geq 0$. Since we have already obtained the opposite inequality, this implies $h_{\mathbb{P},\nu}(\pi_0) = 0$. The last statement follows from Claim 1.

□

Proof of Theorem 11.1. By Corollary 11.4, we need only to prove that $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) \geq H(K, \kappa)$. Let $E : \mathscr{G}^0 \to K$ be the evaluation map $E(x, \omega) = \omega(x)$.

Let $F \subset_f [\mathscr{H}]$ and $\mathcal{R}$ be a finite partition of $\mathscr{H}^0$. We assume $\mathscr{H}^0 \in F, F = F^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ contains $f_1^{-1} f_2 \cap \mathscr{H}^0$ for every $f_1, f_2 \in F$. Let $\mathcal{Q} \leq \mathcal{P}$ be finite Borel partitions of K. Let $\bar{\mathcal{P}} = E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$, $\bar{\mathcal{Q}} = E^{-1}(\mathcal{Q})$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{R})$.

By Lemma 11.5 there exists a finite set $\tilde{F} \subset [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ such that $\tilde{F} \supset F\mathcal{R}$ and $0 < \tilde{\delta} < \delta$ such that if $\sigma : [\![\mathscr{H}]\!] \to [\![d]\!]$ is $(\tilde{F}, \tilde{\delta})$-multiplicative and $(\tilde{F}, \tilde{\delta})$-trace-preserving then there exists a homomorphism $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_0, \sigma, \mathcal{T}, F\mathcal{R}, \delta)$ where $\pi_0 : \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{H}$ is the identity. Let us choose such a map σ.

Let $x : \Delta^0_d \to K$. Define $\psi_x : \Sigma(\mathcal{P}) \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ by $\psi_x(P) = \{u \in \Delta^0_d : \; x(u) \in P\}$. Observe that ψ_x is a homomorphism.

Observe that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}} = (\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{\mathcal{R}})^F = (\bar{\mathcal{P}} \vee \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{R}))^F = (\bar{\mathcal{P}} \vee \bar{\mathcal{R}})^F$. Then for any atom $\bar{P} \in (\bar{\mathcal{P}} \vee \bar{\mathcal{R}})^F$, there exist atoms $\bar{P}_f \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}, \bar{R}_f \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}$ such that $\bar{P} = \bigcap_{f\in F} f \cdot (\bar{R}_f \cap \bar{P}_f)$. This assignment is unique (because $F \subset [\mathscr{H}]$). Define $\phi_x : \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}} \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ by

$$\phi_x(\bar{P}) := \phi\left(\bigcap_{f\in F} f\cdot \pi(\bar{R}_f)\right) \cap \bigcap_{f\in F} \sigma_f \cdot \psi_x(E(\bar{P}_f)).$$

For any $S \subset \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}}$, define $\phi_x(\bigcup_{P\in S} P) := \bigcup_{P\in S} \phi_x(P)$. This defines ϕ_x on $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}})$.

Observe that ϕ_x is well-behaved with respect to unions and intersections in the sense that $\phi_x(A\cup B) = \phi_x(A) \cup \phi_x(B)$ and $\phi_x(A\cap B) = \phi_x(A)\cap\phi_x(B)$ for any $A, B \in \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}})$. However, $\phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)$ need not equal Δ^0_d. So it may not be a homomorphism. Still, we will show that it is close to a homomorphism.

To manage error terms we will use big O notation. The constant implicit in the notation is allowed to depend on $F, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, K, \kappa$ but not on δ, d or σ.

Claim 1. Let $F' \subset F$ and let R' be the set of all $x \in \mathscr{H}^0$ such that for every $f \in F$ there exists a unique $f' \in F'$ such that $\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) \cap f = \mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) \cap f'$. Similarly, let R'' be the set of all $u \in \Delta^0_d$ such that for every $f \in F$ there exists a unique $f' \in F'$ such that $\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(u) \cap \sigma(f) = \mathfrak{s}^{-1}(u) \cap \sigma(f')$. Then $R' \in \Sigma(\mathcal{R})$ and $|\phi(R') \vartriangle R''|_d = O(\delta)$.

Proof. Let $\lambda : F \to F'$ be a function whose restriction to F' is the identity map. Let

$$R'_\lambda = \left(\bigcap_{f\in F} f^{-1}\lambda(f) \cap \mathscr{H}^0\right) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{f_1\neq f_2 \in F'} f_2^{-1} f_1 \cap \mathscr{H}^0\right).$$

Then $R' = \bigcup_\lambda R'_\lambda$. Since each $R'_\lambda \in \Sigma(\mathcal{R})$ by choice of $\mathcal{R}$, this shows $R' \in \Sigma(\mathcal{R})$. By Lemma 9.6 for each $f_1, f_2 \in F$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\phi(f_2^{-1} f_1 \cap \mathscr{H}^0) \vartriangle (\sigma(f_2)^{-1}\sigma(f_1) \cap \Delta^0_d)| \\ \leq\ & |\phi(f_2^{-1} f_1 \cap \mathscr{H}^0) \vartriangle (\sigma(f_2^{-1} f_1) \cap \Delta^0_d)| + |(\sigma(f_2^{-1}f_1) \cap \Delta^0_d) \vartriangle (\sigma(f_2)^{-1}\sigma(f_1)\cap\Delta^0_d)| \\ \leq\ & 4\delta + \tilde{\delta} \leq 5\delta. \end{aligned}$$

So if

$$R''_\lambda = \left(\bigcap_{f\in F} \sigma(f)^{-1}\sigma(\lambda(f)) \cap \Delta^0_d\right) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{f_1\neq f_2\in F'} \sigma(f_2)^{-1}\sigma(f_1) \cap \Delta^0_d\right)$$

then $|\phi(R'_\lambda) \vartriangle R''_\lambda|_d \le 10\delta|F|$. Observe that $R'' = \bigcup_\lambda R''_\lambda$. So

$$|\phi(R') \vartriangle R''|_d \;\; \le \;\; \sum_\lambda |\phi(R'_\lambda) \vartriangle R''_\lambda|_d \le 10\delta|F|^{|F|+1} = O(\delta).$$

□

Claim 2. Let $x : \Delta^0_d \to K$ be random with law equal to the product measure $\kappa^{\Delta^0_d}$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ the probability that $||\phi_x(P)|_d - \mu(P)| \le \epsilon + C\delta$ is at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$. The constant C as well as the constant implicit in the $O(\cdot)$ notation may depend on $P, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, F, K, \kappa$ but not on $\epsilon, \delta, d, \sigma$.

Proof of Claim 2. For $f \in F$, let $R_f \in \mathcal{R}$ and $P_f \in \mathcal{P}$ be such that $P = \bigcap_{f \in F} f \cdot (\pi^{-1}(R_f) \cap E^{-1}(P_f))$. Let $R_P = \bigcap_{f\in F} f \cdot R_f$. Choose a subset $F_P \subset F$ satisfying: for every $f \in F$, for every $x \in R_P$, there exists a unique $f' \in F_P$ such that $\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) \cap f = \mathfrak{s}^{-1}(x) \cap f'$. Such a set exists by Claim 1. The definition of μ implies

$$\mu(P) = \mu(R_P) \prod_{f \in F_P} \kappa(P_f).$$

Note

$$\phi_x(P) = \phi(R_P) \cap \bigcap_{f \in F} \sigma_f \cdot \psi_x(P_f).$$

For $q \in \Delta^0_d$, let $X_q = 1$ if $q \in \phi_x(P)$ and $X_q = 0$ otherwise. Note that $X_q = 0$ if $q \notin \phi(R_P)$. So

$$\mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|] = \sum_{q \in \Delta^0_d} \mathbb{E}[X_q] = \sum_{q \in \phi(R_P)} \mathbb{E}[X_q]$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes expected value with respect to x.

Let T_P be the set of all $q \in \Delta^0_d$ such that for every $f \in F$ there is a unique $f' \in F_P$ with $\sigma(f)q = \sigma(f')q$. By Claim 1, $|\phi(R_P) \setminus T_P|_d = O(\delta)$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|] = O(\delta d) + \sum_{q \in \phi(R_P) \cap T_P} \mathbb{E}[X_q].$$

If $q \in \phi(R_P) \cap T_P$ then

$$\mathbb{E}[X_q] = \text{Prob}(X_q = 1) = \prod_{f \in F_P} \text{Prob}(x(\sigma_f^{-1} q) \in P_f) = \prod_{f \in F_P} \kappa(P_f) = \frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(R_P)}.$$

Because $\phi \in \text{Hom}(\pi_0, \sigma, \mathcal{T}, F\mathcal{R}, \delta)$, $|\phi(R_P)|_d = \mu(R_P) + O(\delta)$. So

$$\sum_{q \in \phi(R_P) \cap T_P} \mathbb{E}[X_q] \;\; = \;\; |\phi(R_P) \cap T_P| \prod_{f \in F_P} \kappa(P_f) = O(\delta d) + |\phi(R_P)| \prod_{f \in F_P} \kappa(P_f)$$

$$= O(\delta d) + \mu(R_P)d \prod_{f\in F_P} \kappa(P_f) = O(\delta d) + \mu(P)d.$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|] = \mu(P)d + O(\delta d).$$

Next we estimate the variance of $|\phi_x(P)|$, which we denote by $\mathrm{Var}(|\phi_x(P)|) = \mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|^2] - \mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|]^2$. Observe:

$$\mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|^2] = \sum_{u,v\in\phi(R_P)} \mathbb{E}[X_u X_v].$$

If $u, v \in \phi(R_P)$ and $\sigma_f u \neq v$ for any $f \in F$ then X_u and X_v are independent. In this case,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_u X_v] = \mathbb{E}[X_u]\mathbb{E}[X_v] = \prod_{f\in F_P} \kappa(P_f)^2 = \frac{\mu(P)^2}{\mu(R_P)^2}.$$

On the other hand $X_u X_v \le 1$ almost surely (regardless of whether or not they are independent) and the number of pairs $(u,v) \in \phi(R_P) \times \phi(R_P)$ with $\sigma_f \cdot u = v$ for some $f \in F$ is at most $|F||\phi(R_P)|$. So

$$\sum_{u,v\in\phi(R_P)} \mathbb{E}[X_u X_v] \le |F||\phi(R_P)| + |\phi(R_P)|^2 \frac{\mu(P)^2}{\mu(R_P)^2}.$$

Because $|\phi(R_P)|_d = \mu(R_P) + O(\delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(|\phi_x(P)|) &\le |F||\phi(R_P)| + |\phi(R_P)|^2 \frac{\mu(P)^2}{\mu(R_P)^2} - d^2\mu(P)^2 + O(\delta d^2)\\ &\le |F|\mu(R_P)d + O(\delta d^2).\end{aligned}$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Prob}(||\phi_x(P)|_d - \mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|_d]| > \epsilon) &= \mathrm{Prob}(||\phi_x(P)| - \mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|]| > d\epsilon)\\ &\le \frac{\mathrm{Var}(|\phi_x(P)|)}{d^2\epsilon^2}\\ &\le \frac{|F|\mu(R_P)d + O(\delta d^2)}{d^2\epsilon^2} = O\left(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Because $\mu(P) = \mathbb{E}[|\phi_x(P)|_d] + O(\delta)$, this implies the claim. □

Claim 2 implies that with probability $\ge 1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$,

$$\sum_{P\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}}} ||\phi_x(P)|_d - \mu(P)| = O(\epsilon + \delta).$$

In this case,

$$|\phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)|_d \geq 1 - O(\epsilon+\delta). \tag{4}$$

Now define a homomorphism $\phi'_x : \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}}) \to \mathcal{B}(\Delta^0_d)$ by choosing $P_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}}$ and defining

$$\phi'_x(P) = \begin{cases} \phi_x(P) & \text{if } P \neq P_0 \\ \phi_x(P_0) \cup (\Delta^0_d \setminus \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)) & \text{if } P = P_0 \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}}} |\phi'_x(P) \vartriangle \phi_x(P)| = O(\delta+\epsilon). \tag{5}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{P \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{F\mathcal{R}}} ||\phi'_x(P)|_d - \mu(P)| = O(\epsilon+\delta). \tag{6}$$

Claim 3. Let $x : \Delta^0_d \to K$ be random with law $\kappa^{\Delta^0_d}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$,

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\phi'_x(E^{-1}(P)) \vartriangle \psi_x(P)|_d = O(\epsilon+\delta).$$

Proof of Claim 3. The definition of ϕ_x immediately implies $\phi_x(E^{-1}(P)) \subset \psi_x(P)$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Therefore, $\bigcup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \phi_x(E^{-1}(P)) \vartriangle \psi_x(P) \subset \Delta^0_d \setminus \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)$. By (5, 4)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\phi'_x(E^{-1}(P)) \vartriangle \psi_x(P)|_d &\leq O(\epsilon+\delta) + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\phi_x(E^{-1}(P)) \vartriangle \psi_x(P)|_d \\ &\leq O(\epsilon+\delta) + |\Delta^0_d \setminus \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)|_d = O(\epsilon+\delta) \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$. □

Claim 4. Let $x : \Delta^0_d \to K$ be random with law $\kappa^{\Delta^0_d}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$, for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $f \in F$,

$$|\phi'_x(f \cdot (\pi^{-1}(R) \cap E^{-1}(P))) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot (\phi(R) \cap \psi_x(P))|_d = O(\epsilon+\delta).$$

Proof of Claim 4. By (5) it suffices to prove Claim 4 with ϕ_x in place of ϕ'_x. By definition of ϕ_x, $\phi_x(f \cdot \pi^{-1}(R)) = \phi(f \cdot R) \cap \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)$ and $\phi_x(\pi^{-1}(R)) = \phi(R) \cap \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)$. Because $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_0, \sigma, \mathcal{T}, F\mathcal{R}, \delta)$, $|\phi(f \cdot R) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot \phi(R)|_d \leq \delta$. By (4) this implies

$$|\phi_x(f \cdot \pi^{-1}(R)) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot \phi_x(R)| = O(\epsilon+\delta)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$.

By definition of ϕ_x, $\phi_x(f \cdot E^{-1}(P)) = \sigma_f \cdot \psi_x(P) \cap \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0)$. So (4) implies

$$|\phi_x(f \cdot E^{-1}(P)) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot \psi_x(P)| = O(\epsilon + \delta)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$.

From the previous two paragraphs we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} O(\epsilon+\delta) &= |\phi_x(f \cdot \pi^{-1}(R)) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot \phi(R)| + |\phi_x(f \cdot E^{-1}(P)) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot \psi_x(P)| \\ &\geq |\phi'_x(f \cdot (\pi^{-1}(R) \cap E^{-1}(P))) \vartriangle \sigma_f \cdot (\phi(R) \cap \psi_x(P))|_d \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$. This implies the claim. □

Claim 5. Given $\epsilon > 0$, we have that with probability at least $1-O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$, for every $f \in F$ and $\bar{R} \in \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{R})$,

$$\sum_{\bar{P} \in E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})} |\phi'_x((f\bar{R}) \cdot \bar{P}) \vartriangle \sigma_{f\bar{R}} \cdot \phi'_x(\bar{P})| = O(\epsilon + \delta).$$

Proof of Claim 5. Let $R = \pi(\bar{R})$ and $P = E(\bar{P})$ for any $\bar{P} \in E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$. Using Claims 3 and 4, we see that with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\bar{P} \in E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})} |\phi'_x((f\bar{R}) \cdot \bar{P}) \vartriangle \sigma_{f\bar{R}}\phi'_x(\bar{P})| = \sum_{\bar{P} \in E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})} |\phi'_x(f \cdot (\bar{P} \cap \bar{R})) \vartriangle \sigma_{f\bar{R}}\phi'_x(\bar{P})| \\ \leq\;& O(\epsilon+\delta) + \sum_{\bar{P} \in E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})} |\sigma_f \cdot (\phi(R) \cap \psi_x(P)) \vartriangle \sigma_f\sigma_{\bar{R}} \cdot \phi'_x(\bar{P})| + |\sigma_f\sigma_{\bar{R}} \cdot \phi'_x(\bar{P}) \vartriangle \sigma_{f\bar{R}}\phi'_x(\bar{P})| \\ \leq\;& O(\epsilon+\delta) + \sum_{\bar{P} \in E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})} |(\phi(R) \cap \psi_x(P)) \vartriangle \sigma_{\bar{R}} \cdot \phi'_x(\bar{P})| \\ \leq\;& O(\epsilon+\delta) + \sum_{\bar{P} \in E^{-1}(\mathcal{P})} |(\phi(R) \cap \psi_x(P)) \vartriangle \sigma_{\bar{R}} \cdot \psi_x(P)| = O(\epsilon+\delta). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses Claim 4, the next one uses the $(F\mathcal{R}, \delta)$-multiplicativity of σ and Lemma 3.2. The third inequality uses Claim 3 and the last equality uses Lemma 9.6. □

Let S be the set of all maps $x : \Delta^0_d \to K$ such that $\phi'_x \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, E^{-1}(\mathcal{P}), F\mathcal{R}, O(\epsilon+\delta))$. Of course this depends on the constant implicit in the $O(\cdot)$ notation but for simplicity we leave this dependence implicit. It follows from Claims 2 and 5 that $\kappa^{\Delta^0_d}(S) \geq 1 - O(\frac{\delta}{\epsilon^2})$.

Define $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}} : K \to \mathcal{Q}$ by $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(k) = Q$ if $k \in Q$. By the law of large numbers

$$|\{s \circ \pi_{\mathcal{Q}} :\ s \in S\}| = \exp(dH_\kappa(\mathcal{Q}) + O(d\delta/\epsilon^2) + o(d)).$$

If $x, y \in S$ and there is some $q \in \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0) \cap \phi_y(\mathscr{G}^0)$ such that $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x(q)) \neq \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(y(q))$ then $\phi'_x|_{E^{-1}(\mathcal{Q})} \neq \phi'_y|_{E^{-1}(\mathcal{Q})}$. For any fixed $x \in S$, the number of elements in the set $\{y \circ \pi_{\mathcal{Q}} :\ y \in S\}$ such that $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x(q)) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(y(q))$ for every $q \in \phi_x(\mathscr{G}^0) \cap \phi_y(\mathscr{G}^0)$ is at most

$$|\mathcal{Q}|^{O(\epsilon+\delta)d} \exp(O(\epsilon+\delta)d)$$

by (4). So

$$\|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \sigma, E^{-1}(\mathcal{P}), F\mathcal{R}, O(\epsilon+\delta))\|_{\mathcal{Q}} \quad \leq \quad |\mathcal{Q}|^{O(\epsilon+\delta)d} \exp(dH_\kappa(\mathcal{Q}) + O(d\delta/\epsilon^2) + o(d)).$$

Because σ is an arbitrary $(\tilde{F}, \tilde{\delta})$-multiplicative, $(\tilde{F}, \tilde{\delta})$-trace-preserving map it follows that

$$\lim_{j \to J} d_j^{-1} \log \| |\mathrm{Hom}(\pi, \cdot, \mathcal{P}, F\mathcal{R}, O(\epsilon+\delta))|_{\mathcal{Q}} \|_{\mathbb{P}_j, p} \geq H_\kappa(\mathcal{Q}) + O(\epsilon + \delta/\epsilon^2).$$

Because $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, by taking the infimum over all $\mathcal{R}, F, \delta$ and noting that every finite subset of $[\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ is contained in a set of the form $F\mathcal{R}$ for some $F \subset_f [\mathscr{H}], \mathcal{R}$ a partition of $\mathscr{H}^0$, we see that $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \geq H_\kappa(\mathcal{Q})$. We can now take the infimum over all $\mathcal{P}$ and the supremum over all $\mathcal{Q}$ to obtain the theorem. $\square$

12. Non-free Bernoulli shifts

This section answers a question of Benjy Weiss on non-free Bernoulli shifts. To explain, we need some terminology. So let G be a countable group, 2^G denote the space of all subsets of G with the product topology and $\mathrm{Sub}_G \subset 2^G$ be the space of subgroups of G. Because 2^G is a compact metrizable space and Sub_G is closed in 2^G, Sub_G is also a compact metrizable space and G acts on Sub_G by conjugation. An *invariant random subgroup* (IRS) is a random subgroup $H \in \mathrm{Sub}_G$ with conjugation-invariant law. This terminology was introduced in [AGV12]. We will be interested in Bernoulli shifts over the coset space G/H of an invariant random subgroup.

Given a Borel space K, let $\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K$ be the set of all pairs (H, ω) where $H \in \mathrm{Sub}_G$ and $\omega : G/H \to K$. Observe that G acts on $\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K$ by $g(H, \omega) = (gHg^{-1}, g\omega)$ where $g\omega : G/gHg^{-1} \to K$ is defined by $g\omega(fgHg^{-1}) := \omega(fgH)$.

Let $M_{inv}(\mathrm{Sub}_G)$ denote the space of conjugation-invariant Borel probability measures on Sub_G, $\eta \in M_{inv}(\mathrm{Sub}_G)$ and κ a Borel probability measure on K. We define a probability measure $\eta \otimes \kappa$ on $\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K$ by

$$d\eta \otimes \kappa(H, \omega) = d\kappa^{G/H}(\omega) d\eta(H)$$

where $\kappa^{G/H}$ is the product measure on $K^{G/H}$. This measure is invariant under the action $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K, \eta \otimes \kappa)$ which is called the *non-free Bernoulli shift over G with stabilizer distribution η and base space* (K, κ).

Example 12.1. If $N \lhd G$ is a normal subgroup and $\eta = \delta_N$ is concentrated on $\{N\}$ then $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K, \eta \otimes \kappa)$ is measurably conjugate to the action of G on the product space $(K, \kappa)^{G/N}$.

Definition 12.1. We say that $\eta \in M_{inv}(\mathrm{Sub}_G)$ is *sofic* if for every $\delta > 0$, finite set $K \subset G$ and open neighborhood $\Omega \subset M_{inv}(\mathrm{Sub}_G)$ of η there exists a map $\sigma : G \to [d]$ (for some integer $d > 0$) such that

(1) for any $g, h \in K$,

$$d^{-1}|\{q \in \Delta_d^0 : \ \sigma(g)\sigma(h)q = \sigma(gh)q\}| \geq 1 - \delta,$$

(2) if u_d is the uniform probability measure on Δ_d^0 and $\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma : \Delta_d^0 \to 2^G$ is the map $\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma(q) := \{g \in G : \ \sigma(g)q = q\}$ then $(\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma)_* u_d \in \Omega$.

Exercise 12.2. If $N \lhd G$ is a normal subgroup and $\eta = \delta_N \in M_{inv}(\mathrm{Sub}_G)$ is concentrated on $\{N\}$ then η is sofic if and only if G/N is a sofic group.

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 12.2. *Let G be a countable group, η a sofic conjugation-invariant Borel probability measure on* Sub_G *and* $(K, \kappa), (L, \lambda)$ *two probability spaces. If* $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K, \eta \otimes \kappa)$ *is measurably conjugate to* $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes L, \eta \otimes \lambda)$ *then* $H(K, \kappa) = H(L, \lambda)$.

Remark 12.3. In several recent talks, Benjy Weiss has proven the following converse: if G is a countable group, η an ergodic non-atomic conjugation-invariant Borel probability measure on Sub_G and $(K, \kappa), (L, \lambda)$ two probability spaces with $H(K, \kappa) = H(L, \lambda)$ then $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K, \eta \otimes \kappa)$ is measurably conjugate to $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes L, \eta \otimes \lambda)$. The proof uses ideas similar to [Bo12].

To prove Theorem 12.2 we will transfer the problem to a problem about principal groupoids defined next.

Definition 12.3. Let G be a countable group and $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ a measure-preserving action on a standard probability space. The *principal groupoid* $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ for this action is defined by:

- $\mathscr{H} = \{(x, y) \in X \times X : \ \exists g \in G \ (gx = y)\}$
- $\mathscr{H}^0 = \{(x, x) : \ x \in X\} \subset \mathscr{H}$;
- ν is the pushforward of μ under the map $x \mapsto (x, x)$.
- $\mathfrak{s}(x, y) = (y, y), \mathfrak{r}(x, y) = (x, x)$, $(x, y)(y, z) = (x, z)$ and $(x, y)^{-1} = (y, x)$.

Now let (Z, ζ) be a nontrivial probability space, $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ be the principal groupoid for the action $G\curvearrowright(\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes Z, \eta \otimes \zeta)$, $(\mathscr{G}, \mu)$ be the principal groupoid for the action $G\curvearrowright(\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes (Z \times K), \eta \otimes (\zeta \times \kappa))$, $\pi_Z : Z \times K \to Z$ be the projection map and $\pi : \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ be the map $\pi((H_1, \omega_1), (H_2, \omega_2)) := ((H_1, \pi_Z \omega_1), (H_2, \pi_Z \omega_2))$. This is a class-bijective measure-preserving extension.

Theorem 12.4. *If $\pi : (\mathscr{G}, \mu) \to (\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ is as above then $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu}(\pi) = H(K, \kappa)$ for any sofic approximation $\mathbb{P}$ to $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 11.1 because $\pi : (\mathscr{G}, \mu) \to (\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ is isomorphic to the Bernoulli shift over $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ with base space (K, κ). □

In order to use the result above, we need to know that $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ is sofic:

Proposition 12.5. *If η is a sofic conjugation-invariant Borel probability measure on Sub_G then $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$, as defined above, is sofic.*

We will derive this proposition as a consequence of a more general result (Lemma 12.8). First we need a definition.

Definition 12.6. Let G be a countable group, $G\curvearrowright(X, \mu)$ be a probability-measure-preserving action, $\mathcal{P}$ be a finite Borel partition of X, $K \subset G$ be a finite set, $M((2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K)$ denote the space of Borel probability measures on $(2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K$, $\mathrm{Stab}(x) = \{g \in G : \ gx = x\}$ (for $x \in X$), $\mathcal{P}(x)$ be the element of $\mathcal{P}$ containing x and $\Psi = \Psi(K, \mathcal{P}) : X \to (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K$ be the map

$$\Psi(x)(k) := (\mathrm{Stab}(kx), \mathcal{P}(kx)).$$

Note $\Psi_* \mu \in M((2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K)$.

We say that $G\curvearrowright(X, \mu)$ is *sofic modulo stabilizers* if for every

- finite $K \subset G$;
- finite Borel partition $\mathcal{P}$ of X;
- open neighborhood Ω of $\Psi_* \mu$ in $M((2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K)$;

- $\epsilon > 0$;

there exist $\sigma : G \to [d]$ and $\phi : \Delta^0_d \to \mathcal{P}$ (for some $d > 0$) such that

- $|\sigma(g)\sigma(h) \vartriangle \sigma(gh)|_d < \epsilon \quad \forall g, h \in K$;
- if $\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma : \Delta^0_d \to 2^G$ is the map $\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma(q) = \{g \in G : \ \sigma(g)q = q\}$ and $\Phi : \Delta^0_d \to (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K$ is the map $\Phi(q)(k) = (\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma(\sigma(k)q), \phi(\sigma(k)q))$ then $\Phi_* u_d \in \Omega$ where u_d is the uniform probability measure on Δ^0_d.

Lemma 12.7. *If $\eta \in M_{cong}(Sub_G)$ is sofic and (L, λ) is any probability space then $G \curvearrowright (Sub_G \otimes L, \eta \otimes \lambda)$ is sofic modulo stabilizers.*

Proof. The proof is similiar to the proof of Theorem 11.1, so we only explain the general idea. Let $K, F \subset G$ be finite, $\tau : F \to L$, $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite Borel partition of L and $\mathcal{P}$ be the finite partition of $\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes L$ defined by $\mathcal{P}(H_1, \omega_1) = \mathcal{P}(H_2, \omega_2)$ if $H_1 \cap F = H_2 \cap F$ and $\mathcal{Q}(\omega_1(fH_1)) = \mathcal{Q}(\omega_2(fH_2))$ for all $f \in F$. Also, let Ω an open neighborhood of $\Psi_*(\eta \otimes \lambda)$ in $M((2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Using arguments similar to the proof of Theorem 11.1 it can be shown that there exists a finite set $K' \subset G$, $\delta > 0$ and an integer D such that if $\sigma : G \to [d]$ with $d > D$ satisfies the conditions of Definition 12.1, $\psi : \Delta^0_d \to L$ is chosen at random with law $\lambda^{\Delta^0_d}$ and $\phi : \Delta^0_d \to \mathcal{P}$ is defined by $\phi(q) = P$ where $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is the set of all $(H, \omega) \in \mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes L$ satisfying $H \cap F = \{f \in F : \ \sigma(f)q = q\}$, $\mathcal{Q}(\omega(fH)) = \mathcal{Q}(\psi(\sigma(f)q)) \ \forall f \in F$ then with positive probability (σ, ϕ) satisfies the conditions of Definition 12.6. Moreover, partitions of the form above are dense in the Borel sigma-algebra of $\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes L$ in the sense that for any Borel $A \subset \mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes L$, $\epsilon' > 0$, there exists a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of the form above and $A' \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P})$ such that $\eta \otimes \lambda(A \vartriangle A') < \epsilon'$. Using this it can be shown that the conditions of Definition 12.6 can be satisfied for *any* finite Borel partition $\mathcal{P}$ (and any K, Ω, ϵ). □

Lemma 12.8. *If $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is sofic modulo stabilizers then the principal groupoid $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ for the action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is sofic.*

Proof. Let $F \subset_f [\![\mathscr{H}]\!]$ and $\delta > 0$. For simplicity, we require $\mathscr{H}^0 \in F$. It suffices to show the existence of a map $\tilde{\sigma} : F \to [\![d]\!]$ such that

- $|\tilde{\sigma}(f_1)\tilde{\sigma}(f_2) \vartriangle \tilde{\sigma}(f_1 f_2)|_d < \delta$
- $|\mathrm{tr}_d(\tilde{\sigma}(f)) - \mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(f)| < \delta$

for every $f, f_1, f_2 \in F$.

To simplify notation, we identify X with $\mathscr{H}^0$ and μ with ν in the obvious way. The first step of the proof is to choose $\epsilon, K, \mathcal{P}, \Omega$ and then apply Definition 12.6 to obtain σ and ϕ out of which we will construct $\tilde{\sigma}$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $F^2 = \{f_1 f_2 : \ f_1, f_2 \in F\}$. For each $f \in F^2$ choose a finite set $K_f \subset G$ and a collection of pairwise disjoint Borel sets $\{A(f,k) : \ k \in K_f\}$ with $A(f,k) \subset X = \mathscr{H}^0$ such that

- $e \in K_f$,
- $A(f,k) \subset \mathfrak{s}(f)$ for every $k \in K_f$,
- $fx = kx$ for every $x \in A(f,k)$,
- $\nu(\cup\{A(f,k) : \ k \in K_f\}) \geq \nu(\mathfrak{s}(f)) - \epsilon$,
- $A(f,e) = \{x \in X : \ fx = x\}$.

To simplify notation, we set $A(f,k) = \emptyset$ if $k \notin K_f$.

Let $K = (\bigcup_{f \in F^2} K_f)^{-1}(\bigcup_{f \in F^2} K_f)$. Because $e \in K_f$ (for every f), $K \supset \bigcup_{f \in F^2} K_f$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a finite Borel partition of X such that $A(f,g) \in \Sigma(\mathcal{P})$ for every $f \in F^2, g \in K_f$. Abusing notation, we will occasionally find it convenient to identify $A(f,g)$ with the set of all $P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $P \in A(f,g)$. This should cause no confusion.

In order to define Ω, for $g,h,k \in K$ and every $f_1, f_2 \in F$ let $Z(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2,g_3)$ be the set of all $\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K$ such that

- $\Upsilon(e) = (H,P)$ for some $H \in 2^G$ with $g_3^{-1} g_2 g_1 \in H$ and
- $P \in A(f_2 f_1, g_3) \cap A(f_1, g_1)$,
- $\Upsilon(g_1) \in 2^G \times A(f_2, g_2)$.

Also let

$$Y(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2) = \{\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K : \ \Upsilon(e) \in 2^G \times A(f_1,g_1), \Upsilon(g_1) \in 2^G \times A(f_2,g_2)\}.$$

Let $\Psi : X \to (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K$ be as in Definition 12.6. Let Ω be an open neighborhood of $\Psi_*\mu$ in $M((2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K)$ such that for every $\omega \in \Omega$, every $f, f_1, f_2 \in F$, every $g, g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$, every $h \in G$ with $g \neq h$, every $k \in G$ with $k \neq e$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon &> |\omega(Z(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2,g_3)) - \Psi_*\mu(Z(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2,g_3))| && (7)\\
\epsilon &> |\omega(Y(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2)) - \Psi_*\mu(Y(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2))| && (8)\\
\epsilon &> |\omega(\{\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K : \ \Upsilon(e) \in 2^G \times A(f,g)\}) - \mu(A(f,g))| && (9)\\
\epsilon &> \omega(\{\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K : \ \Upsilon(e) = (H,P), k \in H, P \in A(f,k)\} && (10)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\epsilon \quad > \quad \omega(\{\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K :\ \Upsilon(g^{-1}h) \in 2^G \times A(f,g),\ \Upsilon(e) \in 2^G \times A(f,h)\}). \quad (11)$$

Inequality (9) holds in a neighborhood of $\Psi_*\mu$ because $\mu(A(f,g)) = \Psi_*\mu(\{\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K :\ \Upsilon(e) \in 2^G \times A(f,g)\})$. Inequality (10) holds in a neighborhood of $\Psi_*\mu$ because the image of Ψ misses this set. To see this, suppose $x \in X$ and $\Psi(x)(e) = (H,P), k \in H, P \in A(f,k)$. Then $k \in \mathrm{Stab}(x)$ and $x \in A(f,k) \Rightarrow fx = kx = x$. But this implies $x \in A(f,e)$. Since $k \neq e$, $A(f,e)$ and $A(f,k)$ are disjoint. This contradiction justifies (10).

Inequality (11) holds in a neighborhood of $\Psi_*\mu$ because the image of Ψ misses this set. To see this, let $x \in X$ and, to obtain a contradiction, suppose that $\Psi(x)(g^{-1}h) \in 2^G \times A(f,g)$ and $\Psi(x)(e) \in 2^G \times A(f,h)$. The first condition implies $\mathcal{P}(g^{-1}hx) \in A(f,g)$ and the second $\mathcal{P}(x) \in A(f,h)$. Therefore, $fg^{-1}hx = gg^{-1}hx = hx$ and $fx = hx$. Therefore $g^{-1}hx = x$. So we have $\mathcal{P}(x) \in A(f,g) \cap A(f,h)$ which contradicts the hypothesis that $g \neq h$ (since $A(f,g), A(f,h)$ are disjoint). This contradiction justifies (11).

By Definition 12.6, there exist $\sigma : G \to [d]$ and $\phi : \Delta_d^0 \to \mathcal{P}$ (for some $d > 0$) such that

- $|\sigma(g)\sigma(h) \vartriangle \sigma(gh)|_d < \epsilon \quad \forall g,h \in K$;
- if $\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma : \Delta_d^0 \to 2^G$ is the map $\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma(q) = \{g \in G :\ \sigma(g)q = q\}$ and $\Phi : \Delta_d^0 \to (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K$ is the map $\Phi(q)(k) = (\mathrm{Stab}_\sigma(\sigma(k)q), \phi(\sigma(k)q))$ then $\Phi_*u \in \Omega$ where u is the uniform probability measure on Δ_d^0.

For $f \in F^2$ let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{BAD}(f) &= \left\{q \in \Delta_d^0 :\ \exists g \neq h \in K_f \text{ such that } q \in \sigma(g)\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))\right\}, \\ \mathrm{GOOD}(f) &= \{q \in \Delta_d^0 :\ \exists g \in K_f \text{ such that } q \in \phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \text{ and } \sigma(g)q \notin \mathrm{BAD}(f)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $f \in F^2$, we let $\tilde\sigma(f) \in [\![d]\!]$ be the set of all $\tau \in \Delta_d$ with $\mathfrak{s}(\tau) \in \mathrm{GOOD}(f)$ and $\mathfrak{r}(\tau) = \sigma(g)\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$ where g is such that $\mathfrak{s}(\tau) \in \phi^{-1}(A(f,g))$. The definition of $\mathrm{GOOD}(f)$ implies the range map restricted to $\tilde\sigma(f)$ is injective, so $\tilde\sigma(f) \in [\![d]\!]$ as required.

To manage error terms we will use big O notation. The implied constant is allowed to depend on F, K, σ, etc but not on ϵ or δ.

Claim 1. For any $f \in F^2$, $|\mathrm{BAD}(f)|_d = O(\epsilon)$.

Proof of Claim 1. For any $f \in F^2$, and any $g \neq h \in K_f$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi\Big(\sigma(g^{-1}h)^{-1}\phi^{-1}\big(A(f,g)\big) \cap \phi^{-1}\big(A(f,h)\big)\Big) \\ \subset\ &\Big\{\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K :\ \Upsilon(g^{-1}h) \in 2^G \times A(f,g),\ \Upsilon(e) \in 2^G \times A(f,h)\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\Phi_* u_d \in \Omega$, (11) implies

$$\Psi_* u_d\Big(\big\{\Upsilon \in (2^G \times \mathcal{P})^K :\ \Upsilon(g^{-1}h) \in 2^G \times A(f,g),\ \Upsilon(e) \in 2^G \times A(f,h)\big\}\Big) < \epsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\big|\sigma(g^{-1}h)^{-1}\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \phi^{-1}(A(f,h))\big|_d < \epsilon.$$

Multiplying on the left by $\sigma(g^{-1}h)$ we obtain

$$\big|\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g^{-1}h))\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \sigma(g^{-1}h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))\big|_d < \epsilon.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have that $\big|\sigma(g)^{-1} \vartriangle \sigma(g^{-1})\big|_d = O(\epsilon)$. Because $g, h \in K_f$, $|\sigma(g^{-1}h) \vartriangle \sigma(g^{-1})\sigma(h)|_d < \epsilon$. Therefore we have:

$$O(\epsilon) \quad = \quad \big|\sigma(g^{-1}h) \vartriangle \sigma(g)^{-1}\sigma(h)\big|_d \geq \big|\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g^{-1}h)) \vartriangle \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g)^{-1}\sigma(h))\big|_d.$$

So

$$\big|\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g)^{-1}\sigma(h))\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \sigma(g)^{-1}\sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))\big|_d = O(\epsilon)$$

which implies

$$\big|\sigma(g)\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g)^{-1}\sigma(h)))\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g))\sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))\big|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

Note that if $q \in \sigma(g)\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))$ then $q \in \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g))$ and there are $q_h \in \phi^{-1}(A(f,h)), q_g \in \phi^{-1}(A(f,g))$ such that $q = \sigma(g)q_g = \sigma(h)q_h$ which implies $q_g \in \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g)^{-1}\sigma(h))$. Therefore,

$$\sigma(g)\mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g)^{-1}\sigma(h)))\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \mathfrak{r}(\sigma(g))\sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h)) = \sigma(g)\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))$$

which implies

$$\big|\sigma(g)\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))\big|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

So

$$|\mathrm{BAD}(f)| \leq \sum_{g \neq h \in K_f} \big|\sigma(g)\phi^{-1}(A(f,g)) \cap \sigma(h)\phi^{-1}(A(f,h))\big|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

□

Claim 2. For any $f \in F$,

$$|\mathrm{tr}_d(\tilde{\sigma}(f)) - \mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(f)| = O(\epsilon).$$

Proof of Claim 2. By definition of $A(f,e)$, $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathscr{H}}(f) = \nu(A(f,e))$. Now $\mathrm{tr}_d(\tilde\sigma(f)) = |\tilde\sigma(f) \cap \Delta^0_d|_d$. Note that if $q \in \tilde\sigma(f) \cap \Delta^0_d$ then either $q \in \phi^{-1}(A(f,e))$ or $q \in \phi^{-1}(A(f,g))$ for some $g \ne e$ in which case $\Phi(q)(e) = (H,P)$, $g \in H, P \in A(f,g)$. By (10) we now have

$$\left|\tilde\sigma(f) \cap \Delta^0_d \setminus \phi^{-1}(A(f,e))\right|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

The definition of $\tilde\sigma$ implies

$$\phi^{-1}(A(f,e)) \setminus \mathrm{BAD}(f) \subset \tilde\sigma \cap \Delta^0_d.$$

So Claim 1 implies

$$\left|\tilde\sigma(f) \cap \Delta^0_d \vartriangle \phi^{-1}(A(f,e))\right|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

Because $\Phi_* u \in \Omega$, (9) implies

$$||\phi^{-1}(A(f,e))|_d - \nu(A(f,e))| < \epsilon.$$

This implies Claim 2. □

For the rest of the proof, we fix $f_1, f_2 \in F$. Because of Claim 2, it suffices to show that $|\tilde\sigma(f_1)\tilde\sigma(f_2) \vartriangle \tilde\sigma(f_1 f_2)| = O(\epsilon)$. For any $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in K$, let

$$\begin{aligned} P(g_1,g_2,g_3) &= A(f_2f_1,g_3) \cap A(f_1,g_1) \cap g_1^{-1}A(f_2,g_2) = \Psi^{-1}(Z(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2,g_3)) \\ Q(g_1,g_2,g_3) &= \phi^{-1}(A(f_2f_1,g_3)) \cap \phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1)) \cap \sigma(g_1)^{-1} \cdot \phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2)) \cap \{q \in \Delta^0_d :\ \mathrm{Stab}_\sigma(q) \ni g_3^{-1}g_2g_1\} \\ &= \Phi^{-1}(Z(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2,g_3)). \end{aligned}$$

By (7) we have

$$|\nu(P(g_1,g_2,g_3)) - |Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)|_d| < \epsilon.$$

Note that $P(g_1,g_2,g_3) = A(f_2f_1,g_3) \cap A(f_1,g_1) \cap f_1^{-1}A(f_2,g_2)$. So the disjointness properties of $A(\cdot,\cdot)$ imply

$$\bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3 \in K} P(g_1,g_2,g_3) = \left[\bigcup_{g_3 \in K} A(f_2f_1,g_3)\right] \cap \left[\bigcup_{g_1 \in K} A(f_1,g_1)\right] \cap f_1^{-1}\left[\bigcup_{g_2 \in K} A(f_2,g_2)\right].$$

By choice of $A(\cdot,\cdot)$, this implies

$$\nu\left(\mathfrak{s}(f_2f_1) \vartriangle \bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3 \in K} P(g_1,g_2,g_3)\right) = O(\epsilon).$$

Since the families $\{P(g_1,g_2,g_3)\}_{g_1,g_2,g_3}$ and $\{Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\}_{g_1,g_2,g_3}$ are each pairwise disjoint, this implies

$$\sum_{g_1,g_2,g_3} |Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)|_d = O(\epsilon) + \nu(\mathfrak{s}(f_2f_1)). \tag{12}$$

Claim 3.

$$\left|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2f_1)) \vartriangle \bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3\in K} Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\right|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

Proof of Claim 3. By definition,

$$\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2f_1)) = \bigcup_{g_3\in K_f} \phi^{-1}(A(f_2f_1,g_3)) \setminus \sigma(g_3)^{-1}\mathrm{BAD}(f_2f_1).$$

So Claim 1 implies

$$\left|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2f_1)) \vartriangle \bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3\in K} Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\right|_d \le O(\epsilon) + \sum_{g\in K}\left|\phi^{-1}(A(f_2f_1,g_3)) \vartriangle \bigcup_{g_1,g_2\in K} Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\right|_d .$$

By definition, $Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\subset \phi^{-1}(A(f_1f_2,g_3))$ for every g_1,g_2. Also the sets $Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ are pairwise disjoint. So

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2f_1)) \vartriangle \bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3} Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)|_d &\le O(\epsilon) + \sum_{g_3\in K} |\phi^{-1}(A(f_1f_2,g_3))|_d - \sum_{g_1,g_2,g_3} |Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)|_d \\
&\le O(\epsilon) - \nu(\mathfrak{s}(f_2f_1)) + \sum_{g_3\in K} |\phi^{-1}(A(f_2f_1,g_3))|_d \\
&\le O(\epsilon) - \nu(\mathfrak{s}(f_2f_1)) + \sum_{g_3\in K} \nu(A(f_2f_1,g_3)) \le O(\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality above comes from (12), the third follows from (9) while the last is implied by the choice of $A(\cdot,\cdot)$. □

Claim 4.

$$\left|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)\tilde\sigma(f_1)) \vartriangle \bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3\in K} Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\right|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

Proof of Claim 4. By definition,

$$\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)\tilde\sigma(f_1)) = \mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_1)) \cap \tilde\sigma(f_1)^{-1}\cdot \mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)).$$

By definition of $\tilde\sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_1)) &= \bigcup_{g_1\in K_{f_1}} \phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\setminus \sigma(g_1)^{-1}\mathrm{BAD}(f_1)\\ \tilde\sigma(f_1)^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)) &= \tilde\sigma(f_1)^{-1}\cdot\left(\bigcup_{g_2\in K_{f_2}} \phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\setminus \sigma(g_2)^{-1}\mathrm{BAD}(f_2)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Claim 1 and the disjointness properties of $A(\cdot,\cdot)$ imply

$$\begin{aligned}O(\epsilon) &= \left|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)\tilde\sigma(f_1)) \vartriangle \left(\bigcup_{g_1\in K}\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\tilde\sigma(f_1)^{-1}\cdot\bigcup_{g_2\in K}\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\right)\right|_d\\ &= \left|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)\tilde\sigma(f_1)) \vartriangle \left(\bigcup_{g_1,g_2\in K}\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\tilde\sigma(f_1)^{-1}\cdot\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\right)\right|_d.\end{aligned}$$

We would like to replace the $\tilde\sigma(f_1)^{-1}$ above with $\sigma(g_1)^{-1}$. To see why this is possible, observe that if $q\in\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\setminus\sigma(g_1)^{-1}\mathrm{BAD}(f_1)$ then $\tilde\sigma(f_1)q=\sigma(g_1)q$. Claim 1 now implies

$$O(\epsilon) = \left|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)\tilde\sigma(f_1)) \vartriangle \left(\bigcup_{g_1,g_2\in K}\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\sigma(g_1)^{-1}\cdot\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\right)\right|_d.$$

Observe that $Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\subset\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\sigma(g_1)^{-1}\cdot\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))$. Moreover the sets $Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ are pairwise disjoint. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\mathfrak{s}(\tilde\sigma(f_2)\tilde\sigma(f_1)) \vartriangle \bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3\in K} Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\right|_d\\ &= O(\epsilon)+\sum_{g_1,g_2\in K}\left|\left(\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\sigma(g_1)^{-1}\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\right)\setminus\bigcup_{g_3\in K}Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)\right|_d\\ &= O(\epsilon)+\sum_{g_1,g_2\in K}\left|\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\sigma(g_1)^{-1}\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\right| - \sum_{g_1,g_2,g_3\in K}|Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)|_d\\ &= O(\epsilon)-\nu(\mathfrak{s}(f_1f_2))+\sum_{g_1,g_2,g_3\in K}\left|\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\sigma(g_1)^{-1}\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\right|_d.\end{aligned}$$

The last equality uses (12). Observe that

$$\Phi\Big(\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1))\cap\sigma(g_1)^{-1}\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))\Big)=Y(f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2).$$

So (8) implies

$$|\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1)) \cap \sigma(g_1)^{-1}\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))|_d = O(\epsilon) + \nu(A(f_1,g_1) \cap g_1^{-1}A(f_2,g_2)).$$

By choice of $\{A(\cdot,\cdot)\}$, this implies

$$\sum_{g_1,g_2 \in K} |\phi^{-1}(A(f_1,g_1)) \cap \sigma(g_1)^{-1}\phi^{-1}(A(f_2,g_2))|_d = O(\epsilon) + \nu(\mathfrak{s}(f_2f_1))$$

which implies the claim. □

Claim 5.

$$|\tilde{\sigma}(f_2)\tilde{\sigma}(f_1) \vartriangle \tilde{\sigma}(f_2f_1)| = O(\epsilon).$$

Proof of Claim 5. Let $Q'(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ be the set of all $q \in Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ such that $\sigma(g_3)q = \sigma(g_2)\sigma(g_1)q$. Since $q \in Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ implies $\sigma(g_3^{-1}g_2g_1)q = q$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$|Q'(g_1,g_2,g_3) \vartriangle Q(g_1,g_2,g_3)|_d = O(\epsilon).$$

By Claims 1, 3 and 4, it suffices to show that if $q \in \bigcup_{g_1,g_2,g_3 \in K} Q'(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(f_2f_1)(q)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(f_2)\tilde{\sigma}(f_1)(q)$ are defined then

$$\tilde{\sigma}(f_2)\tilde{\sigma}(f_1)(q) = \tilde{\sigma}(f_2f_1)(q).$$

By definition, if $q \in Q'(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(f_2f_1)(q)$ is defined then $\tilde{\sigma}(f_2f_1)(q) = \sigma(g_3)q$. If $\tilde{\sigma}(f_2)\tilde{\sigma}(f_1)(q)$ is defined then $\tilde{\sigma}(f_2)\tilde{\sigma}(f_1)(q) = \sigma(g_2)\sigma(g_1)(q)$. If $q \in Q'(g_1,g_2,g_3)$ then $\sigma(g_2)\sigma(g_1)q = \sigma(g_3)q$. So $\tilde{\sigma}(f_2)\tilde{\sigma}(f_1)(q) = \tilde{\sigma}(f_2f_1)(q)$ as required. □

Because ϵ is arbitrary, Claims 2 and 5 imply the Lemma.

□

Proof of Proposition 12.5. This is immediate from Lemmas 12.7 and 12.8. □

Proof of Theorem 12.2. Suppose $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes K, \eta \otimes \kappa)$ is measurably conjugate to $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes L, \eta \otimes \lambda)$. Let (Z,ζ) be a nontrivial probability space. Let $(\mathscr{H},\nu)$ be the principal groupoid for the action $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes Z, \eta \otimes \zeta)$, $(\mathscr{G}_K,\mu_K)$ be the principal groupoid for the action $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes (Z \times K), \eta \otimes (\zeta \times \kappa))$ and $(\mathscr{G}_L,\mu_L)$ be the principal groupoid for the action $G \curvearrowright (\mathrm{Sub}_G \otimes (Z \times L), \eta \otimes (\zeta \times \lambda))$. Let $\pi^K_Z : Z \times K \to Z$ and $\pi^L_Z : Z \times L \to Z$ be the projection maps. Define $\pi_K : \mathscr{G}_K \to \mathscr{H}$ by $\pi_K((H_1,\omega_1),(H_2,\omega_2)) = ((H_1,\pi^K_Z\omega_1),(H_2,\pi^K_Z\omega_2))$. This is a class-bijective measure-preserving extension. Define $\pi_L : \mathscr{G}_L \to \mathscr{H}$ similarly.

Because $G\curvearrowright(\mathrm{Sub}_G\otimes K, \eta\otimes\kappa)$ is measurably conjugate to $G\curvearrowright(\mathrm{Sub}_G\otimes L, \eta\otimes\lambda)$, it follows that $G\curvearrowright(\mathrm{Sub}_G\otimes(Z\times K), \eta\otimes(\zeta\times\kappa))$ is measurably conjugate to $G\curvearrowright(\mathrm{Sub}_G\otimes(Z\times L), \eta\otimes(\zeta\times\lambda))$ from which it follows that $\pi_K : (\mathscr{G}_K, \mu_K) \to (\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ and $\pi_L : (\mathscr{G}_L, \mu_L) \to (\mathscr{H}, \nu)$ are isomorphic.

By Proposition 12.5, there exists a sofic approximation $\mathbb{P}$ to $(\mathscr{H}, \nu)$. Theorem 12.4 implies that

$$h_{\mathbb{P},\mu_K}(\pi_K) = H(K,\kappa), \quad h_{\mathbb{P},\mu_L}(\pi_L) = H(L,\lambda).$$

Because π_K and π_L are isomorphic, $h_{\mathbb{P},\mu_K}(\pi_K) = h_{\mathbb{P},\mu_L}(\pi_L)$ which implies the Theorem.

□

References

[AGV12] M. Abert, Y. Glasner and B. Virag, *Kesten's theorem for Invariant Random Subgroups.* arXiv:1201.3399

[AL07] D. Aldous and R. Lyons. *Processes on unimodular random networks.* Electron. J. Probab. 12 (2007), 1454–1508.

[Av05] N. Avni, *Spectral and mixing properties of actions of amenable groups.* Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc. 11 (2005), 57–63.

[Av10] N. Avni, *Entropy theory for cross-sections.* Geom. Funct. Anal. 19 (2010), no. 6, 1515–1538

[Bo10a] L. Bowen. *A measure-conjugacy invariant for actions of free groups.* Ann. of Math., vol. 171 (2010), No. 2, 1387–1400.

[Bo10b] L. Bowen. *Measure conjugacy invariants for actions of countable sofic groups.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 23 (2010), 217–245.

[Bo10c] L. Bowen. *Nonabelian free group actions: Markov processes, the Abramov-Rohlin formula and Yuzvinskii's formula.* Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 30 (2010), no. 6, 1629–1663. Corrigendum with Yonatan Gutman to appear.

[Bo10d] L. Bowen. *The ergodic theory of free group actions: entropy and the f-invariant.* Groups Geom. Dyn. 4 (2010), no. 3, 419–432

[BG12] L. Bowen and Y. Gutman, *A Juzvinskii Addition Theorem for Finitely Generated Free Group Actions.* to appear in Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems.

[Bo12] L. Bowen, *Every countably infinite group is almost Ornstein*, Contemp. Mathematics, 567, (2012), 67–78.

[Da01] A. I. Danilenko. *Entropy theory from the orbital point of view.* Monatsh. Math. 134 (2001), no. 2, 121–141.

[DG02] A. H. Dooley and V. Ya. Golodets, *The spectrum of completely positive entropy actions of countable amenable groups.* J. Funct. Anal. 196 (2002), no. 1, 1–18.

[DGRS08] A. H. Dooley, V. Ya. Golodets, D. J. Rudolph, S. D. Sinel'shchikov, *Non-Bernoulli systems with completely positive entropy.* Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 28 (2008), no. 1, 87–124.

[DKP11] K. Dykema, D. Kerr and M. Pichot, *Sofic dimension for discrete measured groupoids.* arXiv:1111.2842

[DP02] A. I. Danilenko and K. K. Park, *Generators and Bernoullian factors for amenable actions and cocycles on their orbits.* Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 22 (2002), no. 6, 1715–1745.

[EL10] G. Elek and G. Lippner, *Sofic equivalence relations.* J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010), no. 5, 1692–1708.

[ES04] G. Elek and E. Szabó. *Sofic groups and direct finiteness.* J. Algebra 280 (2004), no. 2, 426–434.

[ES05] G. Elek and E. Szabó. *Hyperlinearity, essentially free actions and L2-invariants. The sofic property.* Math. Ann. 332 (2005), no. 2, 421–441.

[ES10] G. Elek and E. Szabó. *Sofic representations of amenable groups.* Proceedings of the AMS (2011) 139 4285–4291.

[FM77] Feldman, J. and Moore, C.C. *Ergodic equivalence relations and von Neumann algebras I.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **234**, (1977), 289– 324.

[Gr99] M. Gromov. *Endomorphisms of symbolic algebraic varieties.* J. Eur. Math. Soc. 1 (1999), no.2, 109-197.

[Ke12] D. Kerr. Sofic measure entropy via finite partitions. To appear in Geometry, Groups and Dynamics.

[KL11] D. Kerr and H. Li. *Entropy and the variational principle for actions of sofic groups.* Invent. Math. 186 (2011), no. 3, 501–558,

[KL2] D. Kerr and H. Li. *Soficity, amenability and dynamical entropy.* Amer. J. Math. to appear.

[Ku33] C. Kuratowski, Topologie, Warsaw-Livoue (1933).

[Ma40] A. I. Mal'cev. *On faithful representations of infinite groups of matrices.* Mat. Sb. 8, 405-422 (1940). Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2) 45, 1-18 (1965).

[Ol85] J. Moulin Ollagnier. *Ergodic Theory and Statistical Mechanics.* Lecture notes in Math., 1115. Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[Pe08] V. Pestov. *Hyperlinear and sofic groups: a brief guide.* Bull. Symbolic Logic 14 (2008), no. 4, 449–480.

[RW00] D. J. Rudolph and B. Weiss. *Entropy and mixing for amenable group actions.* Ann. of Math. (2) 151 (2000), no. 3, 1119–1150.

[Se12a] B. Seward, *A subgroup formula for f-invariant entropy.* arXiv:1202.5071

[Se12b] B. Seward, *Actions with finite f-invariant entropy.* arXiv:1205.5090

[We00] B. Weiss. *Sofic groups and dynamical systems.* Ergodic theory and Harmonic Analysis, Mumbai, 1999. Sankhya Ser. A 62, (2000) no.3, 350-359.

[Zh11] G. H. Zhang, *Local variational principle concerning entropy of a sofic group action.* Journal of Functional Analysis Volume 262, Issue 4, 15 February 2012, 1954–1985.

Department of Mathematics, University of Texas, Austin,
E-mail address: `lpbowen@math.utexas.edu`